D853
c 2

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.

The Gift of
The Rev. Caleb R. Stetson.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/soteriologyofnew0000will_t9q0

THE SOTERIOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The MMCo.

THE

SOTERIOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

WILLIAM PORCHER DU BOSE, M.A., S.T.D.
PROFESSOR OF EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH

NEW EDITION, WITH A NEW PREFACE

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
1899

All rights reserved

234 P
D853
95863 Cop. 2

COPYRIGHT, 1892,
BY MACMILLAN AND CO.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

PREFACE.

The call for a preface to a new edition has been the occasion of serious reflection upon the question of a general revision of the book. After careful weighing of the considerations on both sides, I have decided against it, mainly for the following reasons.

While coming slowly, chiefly upon exegetical grounds, to the conclusions embodied in the Soteriology, I was aware of no contemporaneous or recent thought upon the main lines therein developed. There was as yet scarcely a symptom of the great outburst of Christological discussion that has since taken place. Within a short period an able and abundant literature has sprung up, to which additions are almost daily appearing. But the main questions remain unsolved, and we are in the midst of issues and controversies no less vital and stirring than those of the Conciliar or the Reformation periods. Such discussions are not to be deprecated; they are not more painful nor less wholesome than they have ever been, and in the end they will bring us, as they have done before, nearer to the great central heart of Christianity. I hope for an opportunity to express my own more developed and definite views on some of these matters, and prefer, therefore, to defer to that occasion any revision or restatement of my views I may have to make.

Meanwhile, first thoughts also have their use and the attraction and advantage of at least a greater freshness and enthusiasm. Upon the divine, and, therefore, unchangeable facts and truths of Christianity, which, like the angels, we cannot but desire more and more to look into, human thought or conclusion can never be final. And every new effort to get to the heart of them, in proportion as it is sincere and historical, is a new impulse to faith and life. I have concluded, therefore, to let the Soteriology go on its course just as it is, with such brief explanation as can be given in this preface, and with the hope of future, and not far off, fuller exposition of the more critical points involved in it.

While still unmoved in my conviction as to the purpose and meaning of the Soteriology and its mission to such as are at the pains to understand it, I am not indifferent to the amount of trouble it may have imposed upon even the best and kindliest disposed. One comes sometimes too late to wish he had been at the least as careful, in such matters, to appear right as to be right. That the Soteriology is open to misconstruction on the surface, from which a deeper and more patient acquaintance would absolve it, has been made only too evident by experience. A friend was good enough to note and report to me Mr. Gladstone's "very appreciative" comments in the copy of the book in his library. On the point of a "human personality" of our Lord, Mr. Gladstone remarks upon "a doubtful use" of the term, but adds that it is evidently "with no evil intent." But not all have seen no evil intent in this and other expressions, and without doubt greater caution, in at least the heading

of one or more chapters and in the table of contents, would have prevented some not unjustifiable prejudice and misunderstanding.

Such offences of expression were, however, not without intention and a purpose, and a brief statement of their motive may best furnish the explanation that is needed.

Reference has been made to my application of a human personality to our Lord. Upon this an Episcopal critic, whose kind judgment I most highly value, wishes that I had been as clear in my discussion of the term *personality* in the Soteriology as in a corresponding passage in my *Ecumenical Councils* (p. 303). He thinks that "confusion on that point prevented many persons from getting the help they might have got" from the earlier work. Now I am quite sure that any one who will read without prejudice the chapter upon the human personality, will agree that so far from the purpose and the effect of it being to assert such a personality as the Church denies in our Lord, it is rather to explain and confirm that denial. Why, then, should the chapter affirm that which it is its purpose, with the Church, to deny? Because it may often happen that not only the best but the only way to explain and confirm a statement in its true sense or meaning is to contradict it in a false sense. What I wished to show was, that in denying to our Lord a human personality in the true sense in which the Church denies it, we are all prone to go farther and deny it in another and different sense in which the Church does not deny but affirms it, as I shall endeavor to prove.

The point to be guarded and safeguarded in this matter is the vital and essential fact of the Unity of our Lord's person. We must remember, however, that, in these high matters of our faith, there is a distinction between holding a fact or truth in itself and making a fetish of the mere terms in which human thought has imperfectly expressed it. No matter how sacred those terms through immemorial use have become to us, the very exposure of their ambiguity and inadequacy is sometimes the only way to bring out the clearness or certainty of the things they are meant to express. Athanasius did not hesitate to confess the ambiguity of the *homoousion*. And the great Fathers of the Trinitarian definition were still more outspoken as to the uncertainty and insufficiency of the Latin terms *person* and *substance*. So much so, that they insisted much upon the truth of the things to be defined in direct contrast with the inexactness and ambiguity of the terms available for their definition. They may be said to have very clearly foreseen the danger we are always in from a blind holding to terms without a clear sense of the things or distinctions they are meant to express. There is no human term that cannot be and is not used in different senses, and in the definitions of the faith it was necessary to fix not only the exact terms used but the exact technical sense in which they are used. It is, therefore, a canon of interpretation that a term in definition is to be understood in the sense that is intended and in no other. And it may very well happen that even a denial of a definition in one sense is in the highest interest of its affirmation and

confirmation in another and the true sense. Certain it is that if we are to go on thinking of *things* we shall have to go on criticising and defining and amending the meaning of *words*. This need not involve a change in the definitions, because the definition has become a mere technical formula set apart from all other uses to mean and express the truth of the thing defined by it. Now, as the truth of the thing cannot change and the definition stands for that truth, whatever it be, the definition need never be changed, but only more and more interpreted and understood, as we understand more of the thing it means. For example, we shall say forever that the Godhead is three Persons in one divine Substance. Now "Persons" here designates not what the word means, but what the thing is that is intended to be expressed by it. There are certain distinctions in the Godhead which we wish to express. We have no human word or words to express the fact of these distinctions, and so we take the best we have and set these apart from all their other uses to mean, in the definition, just what these distinctions are, and nothing else. Thenceforward, retaining the terms, our business is to put more and more exact meaning into them by more and more understanding the thing they mean. The fact of three Persons in one Godhead can only be affirmed in its true sense through the continued denial of more than one prevalent false sense, or sense in which the doctrine as actually held is a false doctrine. In our apparently free handling of words, therefore, it must be judged whether we are not in the best sense loyal even to

the words themselves, and above all to the sacred and eternal things they express to us. All this is insisted upon with reiteration, because in an age that depends upon the thought and definitions of another age there is a clinging, the more passionate because indiscriminate and ignorant, to mere words that, in themselves, carry as much falsehood as truth; and in which the exposure of the falsehood is the only means to the clearing of the truth.

Now in the doctrine of the one Person of our Lord in two natures, there is no possibility of mistaking the exact intention of the definition. It means that our Lord, whether in His divine or in His human nature, is one and the same personal being, or subject. It denies Him a human personality distinct from His divine personality, in the sense of His being a divine person united with another human person.

But now there is another and quite distinct sense, not of person, but of *personality*, which the Church in general council does not deny, but affirms of our Lord in His humanity; but which we, for the most part, in our blind following of mere words, do deny Him. We affirm absolutely the integrity or completeness of our Lord's human nature and life. Now what is a complete human nature and activity? A whole must include all its parts, and most of all those highest parts which are distinctive and characteristic of it. If our Lord was in the completest and highest sense *man*, we must concede to Him not only "body, parts, and passions," but, even more, those higher faculties and functions which distinguish men from the lower beings, viz. consciousness, reason, and the

free will." And accordingly the Church could not but, and at the last did, in general council, acknowledge in our Lord, a human consciousness, reason, will, freedom, and activity." To deny any of these would be, just so far, to deny the reality and completeness of His manhood, which it is heresy to do. Now observe that just those things above enumerated as having been formally conceded as essential to our Lord's humanity, just those things are what, in all human thinking and speaking, are said to constitute *human personality*. And because of the ambiguity of human language, and because in our devotion to words we think we have to deny to our Lord *all* human personality, therefore we practically deny Him these things which are the very essence of His manhood, and the very truth and meaning of His Incarnation. Was I not doctrinally correct, therefore, in saying that, in another and lower sense, different from that intended in the definition of the Hypostatic Union, it was right to affirm and wrong to deny of our Lord a human personality? And was I not morally justified in employing even so extreme a measure to provoke attention to a distinction so vital and so generally and fatally ignored? For it is hard for any of us to realize to what extent we ascribe to our Lord the merest impersonal human nature, and make all his *personal* life in it, not human at all, but purely and only divine. The inevitable growth of a true spiritual science or psychology will compel a growing attention to the reality of our Lord's human consciousness, will, and free activity, and, *in this sense*, to His human personality. These things are, of necessity,

being more and more understood and acknowledged, and doubtless there is in much of the new thought on the subject more of misrepresentation than representation. But if more truth cannot be had without more error, we should, I think, be willing to take both and trust the issue.

Upon the yet more delicate point of the account given in the Soteriology of our Lord's human sinlessness, I must be briefer here and await a fuller opportunity to restate my views. There is no possible question or difference of opinion as to the fact under consideration. In the words of the book itself (p. 229), "to impugn or impair by remotest corollary or consequence the Christian presupposition of the essential human sinlessness and the very personal deity of the incarnate Son of God is to lay an impious finger" upon not only the most gracious truth of God, but the dearest interests of men. The only real question raised in the book is one not at all of Catholic fact or faith, but only of speculative explanation or philosophy. The point under discussion is the *human* explanation and account of our Lord's perfect sinlessness in our flesh. I have held and hold that His human holiness, as it is described in the Gospel and interpreted in the Epistles, is not a mere *fact* but an *act*, — of course, a lifelong act on His part. The New Testament describes human nature not as having been sanctified *for* Him but as being sanctified *by* Him. He Himself in it is humanly the author of its sanctification, redemption, resurrection, and eternal life. Of course, God and the Word and the Spirit are the

real source and cause of all; but we are speaking here of the human conditions and causes of these things in our Lord. The interest of His human life turns upon the process, perfectly divine and yet wholly human, by which our humanity in Him and by His act is raised from sin to holiness, from bondage to freedom, from death to life. Out of all these, by His triumphant holiness and victorious life, He brought us in His own person unto God; and in doing so he is represented as having taken not only our nature but our sin in a much more real (though, of course, only objective) way than is as yet either understood or accepted. If in anything I have said on this or on any other matter in this book, the Faith itself is impugned, and not some merely human view or interpretation of it, I repeat what I said in the book, "Let it be exposed that it may be expelled!"

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Upon the Meaning of Salvation	1
II.	Upon the Meaning of Salvation in the New Testament	16
III.	Of Jesus Christ as our Salvation	32
IV.	Of Christ as our Reconciliation or Atonement.	47
V.	Of Christ as our Redemption	62
VI.	Of Christ both objectively and subjectively, our Redemption and Righteousness	78
VII.	Of Christ as our Resurrection	93
VIII.	Of Christ as our Propitiation or Expiation	107
IX.	Of the End or Final Cause of the Incarnation.	122
X.	Of the Human Personality of Jesus Christ	138
XI.	Of the Divine Sonship of our Lord	157
XII.	Of the Human Birth and Sonship of Jesus Christ	172
XIII.	Of the Human Sinlessness of Jesus Christ	188
XIV.	Of the Sinlessness of Jesus Christ. —*Continued.*	202
XV.	Of the Sinlessness of Jesus Christ. —*Continued.*	216
XVI.	Of the Human Nature of Jesus Christ	230

CHAPTER PAGE

XVII. Of the Human Nature of Jesus Christ. — *Continued* 245

XVIII. Of the Flesh and the Spirit in Relation to our Lord 261

XIX. Of the Work of Jesus Christ upon Earth 279

XX. Of Jesus Christ as the Way 297

XXI. Of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ 312

XXII. Of Jesus Christ as our High Priest 328

XXIII. Of Salvation in the Church 344

XXIV. Of Baptism 360

XXV. Of the Lord's Supper 377

The Soteriology of the New Testament.

CHAPTER FIRST.

UPON THE MEANING OF SALVATION.

"For us men and for our Salvation," the Nicene Creed informs us, our Lord came down from heaven and was incarnate. What is meant by "*our Salvation*"?

What Salvation means and, specifically, what *our* Salvation means, is a matter primarily determined not by creeds, not by Scripture, not by divine revelation, but by the facts of our own nature and condition. All Salvation is deliverance from some form of evil; Salvation for man can only be deliverance from the evil to which he is subject, and what that is is matter of fact prior to any divine or other declaration of what it is. The good of any being is what is necessary for its completion and satisfaction; its evil is whatsoever hinders, limits, or contradicts this. As the former is wholly determined by the nature of each being, so the latter is purely a fact of its condition. Even a divine revelation can only truly declare what it is; it cannot make it anything else.

The nature of a being is, of course, its whole nature, not only what it is, but all that it is constituted

to become. Nature, then, includes destination; it is truly interpreted only in the light of its τέλος, or end. Now if human nature and human destination were wholly known, if the whole good of man were clearly understood and his evil by consequence no less clearly so, there would be no difficulty in defining precisely what for him Salvation must mean. His Salvation would be simply deliverance from that evil and restoration to that good. Divine revelation, therefore, the Scriptures, the creeds of the Church, nowhere undertake or profess to *make* the meaning of Salvation. That is done by the facts of the case, and all that they claim to do is to interpret it truly and deal with it rightly.

In order, therefore, to understand the Scriptures, it is necessary first to understand something at least of those facts of human nature and human condition which the Scriptures presuppose and with which they deal. We begin, then, with a brief discussion of human good and evil.

1st. There is a *natural* good and evil appertaining to all living and sentient beings which is practically synonymous with well or ill being and its accompanying pleasure or pain. Those beings in which *the nature* is all, which are the mere results or products of their nature and their environment — in a word, which are devoid of personality — are capable of no other good or evil than this. But of whatever other or higher forms of good a being may be capable, natural good remains always a part of his aggregate good, and so also with his evil. Εὐδαιμονία, or rational Happiness, is the highest expression of natural good.

2d. But where over and above the nature there exists *personality*, where the being is the result not merely of his nature, but of his own conscious and free activity in the nature, then there exists necessarily for him *moral* good and evil. Even the same law which, when naturally obeyed, constitutes a natural good, — as *e.g.* the simplest law of health, — when personally obeyed, becomes not only a natural but a moral good. The element of morality lies in the fact of its being an *obedience*, *i.e.* not an activity of the nature blindly following its law, but an act of the person in the nature freely choosing his law. Not that obedience or moral good as such is not in itself also the natural good of a person ; for all fulfilling of a being's law is essentially its perfection and happiness. But the moral goodness lies in the fact of its being a personal obedience, and the natural goodness lies in the fact of its being a natural perfection and happiness. And however coincident these two things may be, they are not identical.

As there are beings which are capable only of natural and not of moral good, so it is conceivable that there may be those which are capable only of natural and moral, and of no higher or other form of good or evil. Such would seem to be Kant's conception of man — for whom, according to him, there is no higher real relation than that to the moral law, and no higher end of personal activity than moral obedience.

3d. But Christianity — as all religions, in contradistinction from mere moral systems — presupposes in human nature the capacity for a yet higher kind

of good and evil than these two. This, in the language of the New Testament, we shall call *spiritual* good and evil. The capacity for such a good is found in the possibility of a personal relationship between man and God. I say a personal relationship in distinct contradistinction from natural relationship. For while God bears a necessary natural relation to all things, and while He bears necessarily a yet closer and higher natural relation to all persons, yet this natural relation is not in itself religion, but only the natural ground of the possibility of religion. Man is by nature spiritual only in the sense in which Aristotle would admit that he is, φύσει, moral. That is, only in the sense that he is constituted by his nature to *become* so. He has in his reason and personal freedom the capacity for moral obedience, but it is not until in the right use of his reason and personal freedom he has acquired the habit of moral obedience that he is actually moral. So man is by nature constituted for personal union with God, and in that sense he is naturally spiritual, but he is not actually spiritual until or unless he has actually entered into the union with God for which his nature has constituted him. Religion, which is the expression of the spiritual in man, is a relation of persons, not of natures. The capacity for the relationship must exist as a fact of the natures, but the actuality of the relationship awaits and is only constituted by an act of the persons. However our nature may predestine us to become, it is only by a personal act on God's part and a corresponding personal act on our part, — *i.e.* it is only by divine grace through our

faith, — that we do become sons of God. Spiritual sonship is the fruit of a separate act of personal union between the personal God and each individual person.

Now if it be a fact of human nature that it is constituted for such personal relationship with God, then God and personal union with Him and all that results to us from such union is a good for us. It will be our highest natural good, since in it we shall find the highest completion and satisfaction of our nature and of ourselves. It will be our highest moral good, since in it we shall be personally obeying and fulfilling our highest law. But inasmuch as both a natural and a moral good might exist in beings incapable of personal union with God, this last and highest addition to the notion is best expressed by the term *spiritual good.*

There are, then, three several and distinct goods for man — spiritual good or personal union with God, moral good or voluntary obedience to his law, and natural good or the completion and satisfaction of his nature and the realization and enjoyment of himself. These three, as we have said, are coincident; we might even say that they are materially identical, but they are not formally so. Each lower good is included in each higher, and each higher in each lower, where they all exist. That is to say, not only is my moral perfection an integral part of my natural good as a moral being, but my natural good, so far as it depends on me, is an integral part of my duty or moral perfection. And again, although natural and moral good might both conceivably exist without religion or spiritual

relationship with God, yet where this latter is constituted by our nature to exist, the two former are incomplete without it, and it includes them. So inseparable are the three in our own case that very frequently they coincide in an act which is materially only one, and which yet is at once our happiness, our duty, and the grace of God in us.

Now assuming for our present purpose, with not only Christianity but all religion, that man is constituted for good in all these three forms, the question arises whether in his actual condition he is in full possession and enjoyment of them all. I have again and again to repeat that God Himself can reveal nothing to us which is not in itself true to us. He can communicate no good for which there is no want in our nature, and give deliverance from no evil which does not exist in our condition. Christianity assumes that we are constituted for the goods above described, that God, duty, and happiness are our proper ends. If it assumes falsely, if either of these has no existence for us, then Christianity is not true. If, on the contrary, it assumes rightly, if it addresses itself to just the evils which exist in our condition and provides just the goods which are necessary for our spiritual completion, our moral perfection, and our natural satisfaction, then it is true. If it is mostly in the light and in the language of Christian thought that we express the facts of human good and evil, yet it is not wholly on the authority of Christianity that we hold them. The ultimate authority in the matter is in the facts of the case. We believe Christianity to be true because it reveals these facts, and not that

they are true because Christianity reveals them. I ask, then, again whether man is in possession of his whole good on this earth, or whether as matter of fact he is free from either spiritual, moral, or natural evil? Is he in spiritual union with his God, in moral obedience to his law, in possession and enjoyment of himself and his happiness? If not, then in all these forms he is subject to and needs to be delivered from evil. Is there for man here or hereafter to be any deliverance from his evils, any attainment of his goods? Or of union with God, of the fulfilment of his law, of the satisfaction of his nature, is he to know this only, — that they are never to be!

There is no truth more immediately intelligible and expressive to the mind and heart of man than that implicitly contained in the word Salvation. Because there is no fact of which he is more immediately conscious than that he needs to be saved. What the Salvation is which he needs, and how it is to be accomplished, can only be known, as we have seen, by a full knowledge of his nature and his condition. And such a knowledge of itself it is impossible for human nature at this stage to acquire. Nothing can be fully known save in the light of its *end*. To know what we are, we need to know all that we shall be. *Οιον ἕκαστόν ἐστι τῆς γενέσεως τελεσθείσης, ταύτην φαμὲν τὴν φύσιν εἶναι ἑκάστου, ὥσπερ ἀνθρώπου*, etc., defines Aristotle. "What a thing is when its becoming has been completed, that we call the *nature* of the thing, as *e.g.* of man." Since, therefore, we cannot now wholly know ourselves, the good for which our nature designs nor the evil to which our

condition subjects us — it is impossible that we should have framed for ourselves a perfect theory of what, from the nature of the thing, human Salvation must be. But for all that there is such a thing as human Salvation, and what it is, is precisely determined. It is deliverance *from* the actual evil or evils to which we are subject and *to* the good or goods for which our nature designs us. Moreover, the facts from which it is to be determined, are all within ourselves, however imperfectly we may be able to read them. And though human nature or imagination can as yet form no complete theory of Salvation, yet common sense and experience, and such knowledge as through these we have of ourselves, will enable us to sit in judgment upon such theories of it as are presented to us, and in the end to accept what is true and reject what is false in them. In the long, long run human nature will discriminate between what is true and what is false about itself. If there be offered to it a Salvation which in very truth is its Salvation, it will eventually know and accept it as such. If Christianity be that Salvation, it may be misunderstood; it may be perverted or obscured, and so discounted — for a time. But it will not be lost in the world; humanity will not let it go until it has cleared it up and understood it — and been saved by it. If on the other hand, Christianity be not human Salvation, no authority of Creed or Scripture, no voice of God from heaven, will make it so or impose it finally as such upon the reason and the common sense of mankind. There is but one possible final proof of Christianity, and that is its own essential truth. If it is true, its

truth will prove it; if it is not, no possible proof can make it true. The one contribution that is most needed now as always to the evidences for Christianity, is to let it so appear and speak for itself as that men may recognize in its voice the unmistakable accents of its own inherent authority over their minds and hearts. They will set their seals to it as from God when, and only when, they have found in it the truth, and the whole truth, of themselves.

We shall therefore set ourselves dispassionately and impartially to understand and test upon ourselves the Christian doctrine of human Salvation as contained in the New Testament. But before doing so, let us collect from what has been already said how far we may go in determining *a priori* what elements must enter into a true theory of Salvation.

Aristotle, in discussing the *summum bonum*, the supreme good and final end of man, insists very much that it shall be *ἀνθρώπινόν τι*, something human, something attainable for man and not beyond human reach. Any theory of human Salvation and destination must present to us an ideal of man and man's condition not yet indeed realized, but realizable. Still what we are in search of — although it must be an attainable ideal — is as yet an ideal. In Aristotle himself the definition of a thing is not the *τί ἐστι*, but the *τί ἦν εἶναι* of it — not "what it is," its actual — but "what it were to be it," its ideal. *Man*, *e.g.* is to be defined not by what he is, but by what he would be if he fulfilled his conception — if he were all that it were to be a man. To nothing less than this must a true Salvation bring us, if it is to save us from all

our evil by bringing us to all our good. We seek in man and man's condition not its τί ἐστι, but its τί ἦν εἶναι — not what it ever is here or now, but what it "were," or would be, if it fulfilled its true meaning and law. To what extent we shall succeed in giving its true meaning, or whether what we describe shall be ἀνθρώπινόν τι — true to and attainable by man — we can only leave to the final verdict of the common sense of humanity.

1st. Salvation for man must assuredly include in the end deliverance from natural evil and the securing of all his natural good; that is to say, self-completion and happiness. I say deliverance from evil *and* the securing of good; but these are not two separate things, one of which might take place without the other. On the contrary, they are identical; there is no deliverance from an evil but in the securing of its opposite or corresponding good. Thus there is no other possible Salvation from sickness but health, or from sin but holiness. This seems simple enough, but it is a principle much disregarded, and therefore much to be insisted upon in the matters which we are to discuss. I say that personal well-being and happiness, and therefore deliverance from all that hinders, limits, or contradicts this, must be an element in any complete theory of Salvation. Certainly the full action of Salvation would be unrealized so long as there remains in man or man's condition anything to be delivered from which would be a Salvation.

2d. But by how much moral good is a higher good for man than natural good, by so much is human Salvation a moral rather than a merely natural

Salvation. That which distinguishes man from all other beings on this earth is selfhood, or personality. Besides that in him which is merely of his nature, there is that which is of himself. And that is the distinctive and the highest part of him. That only is *personal* in man into which his own self-determination enters, which is the product and expression of himself and not merely of his nature. And as it is personality in man which is distinctive of him, so it is the good of personality which distinctively concerns him. Now what is the good of personality? It is freedom; by which I do not mean potential or formal, but actual or real freedom. The former belongs to all personalities, the latter to only those which have achieved it, and only so far as they have achieved it. Freedom is not immunity from law but ability to obey, and obedience to, the true or the right law. Every being has its law, which is only an abstract expression of the proper mode of its being and acting. If anything would be itself it must be and act in one certain way and no other, which is distinctive and constitutive of *it*. The expression of this way is the enunciation of its law. Now things are determined according to their law, but persons are left to determine themselves according to their law. In either case the fulfilling of their law, inasmuch as it is the realizing of themselves and the completion of their several natures, is their natural good and their only natural good. But in the case of persons over and above the natural good of self-realization and perfection which comes from their fulfilling, there is the moral good of having *obeyed*, *i.e.* of having

themselves fulfilled, their law. This is freedom, the power and the exercise of obedience or of personal fulfilment of one's law. There is a natural good in the law's being fulfilled, there is moral good in having one's self fulfilled it. The will that has not power, that is not free, to obey its true law is in bondage to some false law. Morality, virtue, righteousness, moral obedience, by whatever name we call it, is the only freedom. Anything else is slavery.

Moral good, then, we find to be identical with true freedom, and this again with a right personal activity, *i.e.* an activity of the person in accordance with his law. Now moral good, however formally distinguishable from it, is itself a natural good. The will is most itself, or rather is only then itself, in the exercise of a true freedom. If there is in us any loss or limitation of freedom, there is just so much loss or limitation of selfhood. It is not only that if one's law is but the expression of one's own perfect being and acting, then any hindrance or limitation of one's fulfilling of his law is just so much limitation of himself; but the fact of freedom in itself is the highest form of personal being and acting, and, therefore, the highest natural good of a person.

It was held by the ancients that virtue was the highest fulfilment of man's nature, because it is a self-fulfilment, *i.e.* not only a fulfilment of self but a fulfilment by one's self. Consequently vice is the worst contradiction of nature, because it is double self-contradiction, a contradiction of one's self by one's self. Now if there be in us any such self-contradiction, any slavery of our will to that which is not ourself

and contrary to ourself, Salvation for us must involve or include emancipation from it. And from slavery the only Salvation is freedom. The only emancipation or deliverance from vice is virtue, from unrighteousness is righteousness. As Salvation from natural evil is to the natural good whose highest expression is *happiness*, so Salvation from moral evil is to that moral good whose highest designation is *righteousness*. Happiness is the highest condition of the nature; righteousness is the highest activity of the person, an activity in obedience to law. I repeat that these two, while formally distinct, are materially identical. Moral good is the natural good of a moral being. In righteousness alone does the free will realize itself and find its satisfaction and blessedness.

3d. If man is not only a natural and a moral, but also, in the sense hitherto described, a spiritual being, then Salvation for him must assume also a spiritual form. We have defined the spiritual in man to be the expression not of an immanent, natural, and necessary, but of a transcendent, personal, and free relationship between man and God. It is a relationship which has to be personally entered into, and only exists where it has been personally entered into from both sides. Man, as has been said before, is naturally spiritual only in the sense that he is constituted by nature to become so; he is actually spiritual only when and so far as he has become so through that personal union and relationship with God, for which his nature predestines him and which constitutes what we call religion.

If God be God; if man is made for God, *i.e.* for not only natural and necessary dependence upon Him, but personal, free, and reciprocal relationship and intercourse with Him; if the fruit of this union of God with him is, as a matter of spiritual fact, something more in him than could come of himself; if the effect of it is to make him in some real sense Son of God, other and higher than in the sense in which the poet says truly that we are "all His offspring" — if all these, I say, be facts in themselves to which our nature predestines us prior to all creeds, Scripture, or revelation, then they are facts which it is impossible to leave out of account or to put out of account in any question of the nature, condition, or destination of humanity. And if man *be not* in that relationship of actual union with God for which his nature as a spiritual being thus predestines him, in which he would be if he were the spiritual man which is an integral part in the true concept, the τί ἦν εἶναι, of manhood; if in any way and for any reason he is not only not at one but in separation from and at practical enmity with God; if instead of being ἔνθεος he is ἄθεος in the world — if these be facts in his actual condition, then is he in the very nature of the case in need of spiritual Salvation. He needs to be reconciled, reunited, or made at one with God, who is his supreme good, the condition of his highest not only spiritual but moral and natural completion, perfection, and blessedness.

And there is no other Salvation for disunion from God but union with God. Wherein the disunion or separation consists, and what is the union which ought

to exist, between God and us depends upon and is to be determined from the nature of the thing. No mere *authority* of creed, Scripture, or revelation can make it if it is not or what it is not. But if they reveal it as it is and speak truly to the truth that is in us, then we will set our seal to them that they are true. This is no appeal to the private judgment of every individual man, but to the right spiritual reason and the universal common sense and spiritual experience of humanity.

It may be well to repeat, what has been more than once implied, that if man be indeed spiritual or constituted for spirituality in the above sense, then that act on his part by which he knows and is one with God is not only a spiritual, but at the same time the most moral and the most truly natural act of which he is capable. Faith is the highest obedience and the completest self-realization and satisfaction.

The threefold distinction not only underlying this chapter but running through the whole book, might be briefly restated as follows: Self-realization as it is a realization *of* self is natural good. As it is a realization *by* self it is moral good. But as it is a self-realization in both senses only *in God*, out of whom neither is possible, it is spiritual good. As our good the three are one. But our one good is God, righteousness, and life, which are three.

CHAPTER SECOND.

UPON THE MEANING OF SALVATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I HAVE taken the position that if the whole nature, the proper destination and the actual condition of humanity were perfectly known to us, a perfect theory of human salvation could be constructed by us *a priori*. That is, we could precisely define beforehand what it must be. Given what our evil is and what our good would be, we could deduce what our Salvation must be.

I say now that if Christianity be what it professes to be, the divine, absolute, and final religion, the true, real, and actual redemption and completion of humanity, it must propose and accomplish just that Salvation which under the above supposition we should have *a priori* determined and defined. We have not the necessary knowledge and we cannot construct such a complete *a priori* definition of Salvation. But that there is such a thing as a true Salvation for humanity, that there is a τί ἦν εἶναι, or true concept of it, we can no more doubt than that there is such a thing as a truth, a true constitution or law, of nature, although our science or knowledge of it may fall very far short of

the truth: or that there is such a thing as right conduct, although no ethical system may exactly express what it is.

Again, if Christianity be true in the sense above stated, then there is a true Christian doctrine of Salvation, however Christians may misinterpret and differ about it, and even though there be not as yet any adequate understanding or statement of it. Perhaps no two theologians would exactly agree in a theoretical explanation of *how* Jesus Christ is our Salvation, or even of *what* precisely Salvation is. Yet all would agree that in itself Salvation is a definite thing, and that not only is He our Salvation, but there is a true explanation of how He is so. It is to be confessed that there is just now dissatisfaction with existing explanations. Who in these days will profess himself quite satisfied with his own theory or statement of the atonement, or will claim that there is *any* theory or explanation which generally satisfies the mind of sincere Christians, or of the Church, or of any considerable section of the Church? It is not that Christians do not believe in the fact of Salvation in Christ, but only that they are just now considerably at sea in their speculative opinions of not only how it is but precisely what it is. This is not quite so bad as it may seem. Two men might differ never so widely in their speculations as to what gravitation is, and yet so long as they both practically respect the fact that, no matter *what* it is, it nevertheless *is*, they may equally live under it and equally enjoy the benefit of it. But if either of them should not only reject all theory, but undertake to practically ignore the fact of gravi-

tation, the consequences would be very different. The illustration is only partially applicable, because to be practically saved in Christ is not so independent of some knowledge of what and how Salvation is in Him, as living under the law of gravitation is of any theoretical knowledge of it. But it does apply this far, that many men of many minds as to the theory of Salvation do equally hold the fact of it and do equally enjoy the benefit of it. And while I do not at all mean to say that right speculative opinions are not important or that an exactly true theory of Salvation would not materially help and heighten the fact of it in us, yet I do hold that our speculative differences and uncertainties as to the exact what and how of Christian Salvation are not quite so serious or fatal a matter as they might seem to be. We are glad to be all agreed in this: that many are saved practically who theoretically know least how they are saved. And no one of us, perhaps, professes to know so perfectly what Salvation is that any other need perfectly agree with him. Christianity, if it is divine, is wiser than any of us understand even as it is mightier than any of us experience. The fault is with us, but if we already comprehended the full wisdom and felt the full power of the grace of God in Jesus Christ there would be nothing more for us to know or to be. As long as the world lasts shall we, and ought we, to be knowing more and more of what Salvation in Christ means.

Whither shall we go for a doctrine of Christian Salvation? To the mind of the Church? But the mind of the Church, while it has been made up from the beginning and has undergone no change as to the fact of

Salvation in Christ and the essential contents of that fact, has by no means been always one with itself in its theoretical or speculative explanation of the fact. Or rather we should say, perhaps, that the Church as such has not and cannot have such an explanation. The Church holds facts which never change; it cannot hold opinions which must be and ought to be always changing. The Church's theory, or rather the prevalent theory in the Church, in *what* age would it have been well to stereotype as authoritative forever? As, *e.g.* the facts enumerated in the Apostle's Creed have been. There *is*, then, no authoritative statement or finally complete theory or philosophy of Christian Salvation; and there never will be or ought to be. To be engaged forever upon such a doctrine is the proper occupation of the human mind. To comprehend the wisdom of God more and more, that we may more and more know His love and experience His grace and power — what can better occupy all our powers of mind and heart?

Shall we go then to the Scriptures? The preceding remarks in one respect apply even more strongly to the Scriptures. If the New Testament contained an explicit, authoritative, and final doctrine of the philosophy as well as the fact of Salvation, the present discussion would be impossible within the Church. And eighteen hundred years of Christian thought and discussion would be equally out of place. The very word Atonement would not exist, for it has no equivalent in the New Testament. The New Testament no more gives us doctrine than nature gives us science. It gives us the facts but

not the theory, the matter of all Christian doctrine, but no finished doctrine or doctrines of the whole matter of Christianity.

The Scriptures themselves (I am speaking now of the New Testament) nowhere profess to be, or realize that they are to become, a primary or original revelation of the facts and truth of Christianity, or a final statement of Christian doctrine. They presuppose the truth as having been revealed in Christ and already existing in the mind of the Church. And they are to us now the only existing witness and record of how that truth was understood by those to whom Christ immediately gave it. Our present purpose requires of us no higher claim for the Scriptures than is involved in the following admissions and positions: —

1st. We could not even understand, much less be able to attach their peculiar value, to the Scriptures, if we were not conscious of, and if they did not speak to, those facts of universal human experience which give all their truth and all their interest to the Scriptures.

2d. The Scriptures are not Christianity, but themselves a product of Christianity. They are a witness to it, and a record of it, of peculiar value; but Christianity might have been, and may be, a divine fact and factor in human history and human life upon any tenable theory of what the Scriptures are; and even (conceivably) if there had been no Scriptures at all. The New Testament assumes the truth of Christ and of human Salvation in Christ; it does not create or originally communicate this truth.

3d. We cannot interpret the Scriptures apart from that mind of the Church which originally produced them, and whose subsequent historical understanding of them, on the lowest grounds, we can even less rationally ignore, than if, in studying nature, we should despise all the already attained results of natural science.

The mind of the Church seems just now, as to the results of its past and the direction of its future, thinking upon the subject of the Atonement, sufficiently divided, unsettled, and unsatisfied to justify the demand of which we sometimes hear for a revision and restatement of the doctrine. This demand, so far from being directed against, may be made in the interest of the divine element in the Person of Christ and in the work of human Salvation. If it be permissible to revise what it was permissible to think, and what *has* been revised and thought over again and again in the history of Christianity, we must indeed carry back with us the experience of the ages, but we must go back to the beginning and to the sources of all our thought. I go back, then, to the facts of human nature and to the original and essential attitude and relation of Christianity to those facts. And I go back to the New Testament simply as a record of the mind of Christ, and of the first mind of the Church upon the true nature and mode of human Salvation in Christ.

Whatever may be our theory, or whatever may be the truth, with regard to the New Testament Scriptures as to their more or less human or divine origin and authority — as a matter of fact, I believe them

to contain a single, consistent, complete and true soteriology, or doctrine of human Salvation. Of course I mean that they contain this implicitly and not explicitly, as nature contains the whole truth of science, not wholly revealing but never contradicting and always confirming it. The mind of the New Testament is one mind. How this comes to be so; how so many and so different writers from so many and different points of view and in such different ways should be so of one mind as to the meaning of Salvation and the fact and mode of its realization in Jesus Christ is a question of the deepest interest. But it does not belong to us here, and our discussion is quite independent of it. I have no theory to present of the fact or mode or extent of the inspiration or divine origin or authority of the New Testament. I am to this extent indifferent — not, indeed, to the value of it as our only report and record of the origin of Christianity, but to the question of how far it is a divine record — that it seems to me that the existence of Christianity as a divine fact, a presence and power of God for Salvation in the world, by no means necessarily stands or falls with any theory of the inspiration of its record. Let it be, and be treated, entirely as other books and it may, and I believe will, still answer all the purpose of a record of the truth of Christ, and its original acceptance by the Church. If Christianity itself be divine, it need not of necessity follow that its record must be so.

Nevertheless, it takes something more than a merely literary or scientific criticism to be able to

deal adequately with the claims that have been set up for the Scriptures in the Church. Let any one have to do with them habitually, not in the way of outside criticism but of inward and spiritual understanding, and he will find those claims growing upon him too. I believe that the Scriptures are Scripture because they are true, and not true because they are Scripture. It was the selection and acceptance of the Church that made them Scripture, and the Church selected and accepted them because they expressed its own true mind. Without then at all entering into the question of the inspiration or divine authority of the New Testament Scriptures as such, I simply hold that as a matter of fact they represent to us the mind of the Church which originally received and accepted Jesus Christ, and that that mind is one on the subject of His divine Person and His divine Salvation.

What, then, to begin, is the meaning of Salvation in the New Testament? The word itself assumes the existence of an actual evil from which, and a possible good to which, man needs to be saved. But it does not state what either is. We may be *a priori* assured, however, of one thing. A divine Salvation is an absolute Salvation. Such a Salvation for man must be not only from *his* evil to *his* good, but from *all* his evil to *all* his good. It is natural enough that in the New Testament the word should not be used in every instance in the whole length and breadth of its meaning. Any part of Salvation is Salvation, and in this or that connection the word may mean only one or other aspect of its whole sig-

nificance. For example, it may mean only a present forgiveness of sin, or exemption from some consequence or consequences of sin. But Christian Salvation must mean *all Salvation*. It must be Salvation from all sin, the fact of it, the imputation of it, the consequences of it. If any part is not provided for and included in it, it is not human or divine Salvation. We shall find that the New Testament conception of Salvation fully satisfies this demand, if in constructing our definition from it we stop at no partial generalization, but are careful to make our induction from all the particulars.

The word Salvation comes over into the New Testament from the Old, and it comes freighted with many associations which invest it with something of a figurative and poetical character. As, *e.g.* in 1 Cor. 15, where death is personified as the last of a number of enemies to be overcome and destroyed in the Messianic Salvation. The more external and temporal Salvations of the Old Testament, which familiarized the mind to the great truth of God as Redeemer and Saviour of His people, are generally from personal enemies, as Pharaoh, the heathen, and especially the great world powers which successively oppressed them. The idea of Salvation had finally shaped itself into the definite hope of the Messianic redemption, the expectation of a divine deliverer who should save them from all their enemies. But who and what were these enemies? We may be sure that when we have passed beyond the mere outward figures and symbols of things to the things themselves, when we come to do with that which is Salvation indeed, it shall be

from those things which are enemies indeed. And has not humanity its enemies? And what are these in the last analysis but ignorance, and sin, and death! No merely outward enemies are in themselves enemies. Pharaoh was the helper of Israel's redemption as Judas was of our Lord's exaltation. The devil himself is to God's saints a ministering spirit sent forth to minister to the heirs of Salvation. Naught in this universe hurts or can hurt us but what we ourselves are and do. All things work together for our good, save as we ourselves defeat them and are our own enemies. What we need to be saved from is ourselves; and our only Salvation is that death of ourselves which is the life of ourselves. The cross is the only instrument of human Salvation. In 1 Cor. 15, we are told in Messianic, Old Testament language, that Christ must "reign until all enemies are put under His feet." The last enemy that shall be abolished is Death. But death is the last because sin must be the first. Jesus Christ could only abolish death by first abolishing sin. When these are abolished man is saved. But it must be an abolishing not only in Christ but in man. And it must be a real and a full or complete abolishment.

I have said that the term Salvation itself gives no hint of what it is, *i.e.* what it is from and what it is to. This we have to gather from a number of other terms by which, in its various aspects and parts, it is habitually defined or described in the New Testament. Of these I will specify the principal ones, at present only briefly defining them and reserving a fuller discussion of their meaning for subsequent chapters.

1st. Καταλλαγή, *Reconciliation.* This word is once in the Authorized Version, Rom. 5 : 11, translated *Atonement*, which does not otherwise occur in the New Testament. In the Revised Version the proper translation, reconciliation, is restored. Atonement could not be properly used here in its modern acquired sense, but only in the sense of At-one-ment. And thus it expresses the great truth that in Jesus Christ we have been made *at one*, and *one*, with God. This implies a previous state of separation from God, but that the separation has been in Christ abolished and we restored to oneness with God.

Such terms as reconciliation presuppose the fact of man's spiritual nature as defined in the first chapter. The fact, that is, that we are constituted by nature for personal and spiritual union and relationship with God. This relationship is a *real* one and is the source of a spiritual quality in man which St. Peter describes as a partaking of the divine nature. The distinctive quality of Christian character and life is *holiness.* And what is distinctive in holiness is not only *what* it is but *whence* it is; not only its essence but its source. Holiness is the divine nature; it means *what God is.* And in any other being than God it means a partaking of the divine nature. All holiness is of the Holy Ghost. It is a spiritual quality imparted by the divine Spirit. It is what God is in us, what we are by the operation of the divine Spirit and through participation in the divine nature. It is to be carefully observed that it is not a natural quality, or the fruit of a natural relationship with God. No man is holy, φύσει, by the mere fact of his nature; he can

only become so by act and habit of his personal spirit, by a personal relationship personally entered into between him and God. To be at one with God, or at peace with God, is no mere external relation, but an internal relationship. It is to be of one spirit and one nature with God. It is holiness.

As oneness with God is holiness, so a spiritual and personal separation and difference from God is *sin*. Sin is what we are when God is *not* in us; when instead of being ἔνθεοι we are ἄθεοι in the world; when we are not what God is but what we and the world are without God. So in his first Epistle, St. John tests our being "of God," our alleged birth and life "from God," by a comparison of what we are with what God is. If then holiness is the divine nature, sin is a nature or a condition of nature in us not of God and not divine. It is the negation or contradiction of holiness. Disunion, separation, enmity with God is thus an actual state of things. It is a nature, or condition of nature, and a consequent mode of personal life in our nature which makes us actually separate and different from the divine nature and life. "It is your sin that separates between you and your God" — because sin is an actual separation between us and God. The separation is a *real* one; there is an actual something, a wrong Spirit, a false nature, that intervenes between God and us and separates us from Him. Reunion, reconciliation with God, therefore, can have but one meaning. The only real reunion possible is the removal of that which separates. And the only possible removal for us must be — or must *intend* to be, must eventually

be — a removal in us. The only removal or doing away of sin must be a removal of it from *where it is*, viz. in us. If Jesus Christ is in a real and perfect or complete sense our reconciliation, we must be able to show that He is both for us and in us the actual abolition of the whole fact of sin and all its consequences. But the only abolishment of sin is holiness, just as the removal of sickness is health or of death is life. There is no other real being at one with God than an actual unity of Spirit and nature and life with Him. A mere forgiveness of sin, *e.g.* in our human sense, is no divine ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας, or ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας, or καταλλαγή. God's doing or putting away is not as man's. His real and whole abolishment of sin in Christ is something more than the laying aside of His displeasure or the remission of our punishment. It is a blotting out of the whole fact and all the consequences of sin. I do not deny that the idea of reconciliation is sometimes in the New Testament restricted to the several steps or stages in the great total act of human reconciliation. Thus it is said that we were reconciled to God by the blood or death of Jesus Christ. But while in the grace of God and in our faith our reconciliation is viewed as completed in Jesus Christ — *in fact*, it will only be completed when in Christ *we* shall be dead to the sin that separates us from God and alive in the holiness which is the only real reconciliation with Him. And Christ is only our reconciliation in faith because He is to be so in fact. His death and resurrection could in no sense be received as ours if they were not in very fact to be ours. Reconciliation, however properly it is applied

to the great preliminary conditioning and producing act of our reunion with God, yet in its totality must include the culmination and end of that act in our own actual oneness with God. And one falls very far short of the full teaching of the New Testament who does not see in it provision for such a real reconciliation, such a real reunion with God in Christ through our own death in Him to sin, and our own resurrection and new life in Him of holiness.

2d. Ἀπολύτρωσις, *Redemption.* Redemption assumes a state or condition of bondage or slavery. And bondage is the negation or absence of freedom or liberty. Now freedom can have but one meaning. It is for any being, as we have seen, ability and opportunity to be or to become itself by fulfilling its law. Whatever hinders, limits, or prevents this is bondage or slavery. Whether man *is* free — or whether he needs to be *made* free, or redeemed — is not mere matter of opinion but, one way or the other, a fact of his condition. The question is, are we in obedience to our law, and in the way at least of the full realizing of ourselves? Or are we, on the contrary, in a state of disobedience, and in habitual, both voluntary and involuntary, violation of our law and contradiction of ourselves? Man's law is distinctively not a natural but a moral law, and obedience to it is not only life but *righteousness.* His bondage consequently is moral bondage, and his redemption must be a moral redemption. Nothing else would be redemption for him but the removal from him of moral weakness and inability by the restoration to him of moral power — the power of obedience, the

power of righteousness. Here, again, as in the previous definition and everywhere, I would apply Aristotle's principle that a thing is always to be defined by its *end*, by what it is when its *becoming* is completed, and it has accomplished or become its whole self. Neither human nor divine redemption, redemption of man, nor redemption by God, can stop short of or mean anything less than a real and a whole redemption. It must be the actual emancipation of humanity from all bondage, from all that hinders, limits, or prevents its full freedom. And since for us freedom is identical with righteousness, Christ, our redemption, is Christ, our righteousness. And Christ is objectively, in Himself, our redemption and our righteousness — only as He is potentially and is to be actually so subjectively. That is, only as we are to be in Him made free from all bondage by being brought into the actual freedom of a perfect righteousness in ourselves.

We shall see that freedom or righteousness is possible for us only in God; that without the spiritual character of holiness we cannot have the moral quality of righteousness; that without reunion with God we cannot be redeemed from transgression of His law. We shall see, moreover, that redemption from sin will be redemption from death; that is, that restoration to spiritual and moral good will be followed by restoration to natural good, and to be free from spiritual and moral evil will be to be free from all natural ills. The essence of consummated redemption we shall find with St. Paul to be expressed in these words: "The law of the Spirit of life which is

in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

Ἀνάστασις, *Resurrection.* Resurrection presupposes death which is, of course, the negation or absence of life. The three goods for man as a spiritual, moral, and natural being are holiness, righteousness, and life — *i.e.* union with God, obedience to his law, and realization of himself. These three, as has been said, may be materially identical though they are formally distinct. To be out of God if it is our nature to be in Him — to be in disobedience to a law which it is our nature to obey — are not only spiritual and moral, but natural evils. That is, they are not only sin and transgression, but death. The body is diseased and dies in proportion as it fails to discharge its natural functions and to supply its natural wants. Spiritual and moral function and satisfaction are as necessary to spiritual and moral life as physical, and are as much a part of us and our nature. In this sense sin and moral disobedience or unrighteousness are in the New Testament synonymous with death. And not only *are* they spiritual and moral death, but they are the reason or cause of physical death, and the abolishment of them shall be the abolishment of it.

Each of the above definitions will be further expanded and justified at length in separate chapters. But first, let us see how in the New Testament Jesus Christ is made, in each of the above senses and in the unity of them all, not only our Saviour but our Salvation.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF JESUS CHRIST AS OUR SALVATION.

In the New Testament conception of the matter Jesus Christ not only bears a very near and necessary relation to our Salvation, but He is our Salvation. And He is so in no merely representative and figurative, but in a very material and real way. This can have but one meaning, viz. that our Lord is in Himself, that He is to or for us, and that He is to be in us — all that constitutes or would constitute our Salvation. Thus, if our previous representations of the facts of the case are correct, He is, *first*, our reconciliation, or at-one-ment. He is that actual personal oneness of God with man and man with God, which is in itself our spiritual good, and our only cure or Salvation from spiritual evil. He is holiness, by which we mean the personal or spiritual quality, character, or nature of God communicated to and realized in man. He is, *secondly*, our redemption. He is that actual freedom of humanity from the bondage of sin and death, and its obedience to its true law of holiness and life, which is in itself man's moral good, and his only Salvation or emancipation from moral evil. He is righteousness, by which we mean

the freedom of moral obedience and the obedience of moral freedom. And, *thirdly*, He is our resurrection. He is that actual raising or rising of humanity out of all such limitation, contradiction, and destruction of its true being and selfhood as is properly denominated death, which is in itself man's natural good and his only Salvation from natural evil. He is our life, by which we mean self-completion, the perfection of our being through the full realization of our whole nature.

In a word, Jesus Christ is our Salvation because He is in Himself, and is or is to be in us, all that Salvation means and is. Because He is, both in Himself and in us, a perfect actual human holiness, righteousness, and life; and because these are for us what, all of what, and what alone, Salvation is.

Although the above is the literal and consistent position of the New Testament, it is not always so understood. And as it is not at once apparent how we can understand and receive the truth in so simple and literal a sense, it is well to attend carefully to a few preliminary considerations.

We have said practically that Jesus Christ is our Salvation simply because He *is so; i.e.* because He is in very actuality and reality just that, and all that, which our Salvation must be defined to be. This He is, first, objectively or in Himself, and, secondly, subjectively or in us. Thus He is holiness and our holiness; righteousness and our righteousness; life and our life — and these three are the only real Salvation for us in the only three senses or respects in which we need or are capable of Salvation. All that

He is for us He is first in Himself, and all that He is in Himself, He is, or is to be, in us. In what sense is it correct to say that Jesus Christ, either in Himself or in us, *is* holiness, righteousness, or life? In the first place, these are properties or qualities only, of any one of which it might seem more proper to say that He possesses it, than that He is it. We might say that He is holy or righteous, but why, or how, that He is holiness or righteousness or life?

1st. If our Lord were only an individual man among men, — I do not mean if He were a *mere* man, but if, being all that He is, He had become only an individual man, related to other men only as any other man to other men, — there would be less propriety, but even then there would be a very great propriety and truth in the above mode of representation. In the case supposed, Jesus Christ in the perfection, or rather in the becoming or being made perfect, of His individual humanity, of His personal human holiness, righteousness, and life, would be to us simply a revelation — but a divine revelation — of what human Salvation is, or "were." The end or purpose of the Incarnation might then be conceived to be to reveal to us in *that* man the τί ἦν εἶναι of man, the divine idea or ideal of what he is and is to be, and of how he is to be it; the secret of his Salvation and destination. Christ would then be to us, if no more, a divine objective revelation and declaration of what Salvation is; viz. that it is holiness, righteousness, and life; a perfect oneness with God, a perfect fulfilling of our law and a perfect being, becoming, or realizing of our whole selves. But qualities

or character or life cannot exist or be manifested *in abstracto*, and unlike man's, all God's revelations are *in concreto*. He reveals Himself not in words, but in things, events, or persons. In the Old Testament He did not teach man faith by definition, but by Abraham; and in the New, He teaches us holiness, righteousness, and life, not by formula, but by Jesus Christ. God's revelation of human Salvation is the manifestation of the thing itself in the person of the man, Christ Jesus. To be saved for any man means to be in that personal and spiritual relationship with God, of perfect faith, perfect grace, and consequently perfect holiness, which we recognize as existing in the one only perfect spiritual manhood of our Lord. It means to be in that relation to the one law of God, the universe, and ourselves — of perfect obedience and righteousness — which we see existing in the one only perfect ethical or moral manhood of our Lord. And finally, it means that perfection of human being, acting, and self-realization, which we see to exist only in the one perfect life of our Lord. Jesus Christ is equally the revelation to us of how and what God is in man, and of how and what man is in God. We see in *Him* "what it were" for *us* to be saved. In the sense so far described, we might say that Jesus Christ is our Salvation *exemplarily*. That is, He is the perfect *example* to us of what we must be in order to be saved.

2d. But we fall very far short of the New Testament conception of Jesus Christ as our Salvation if we stop at the above sense of it. It is certainly a true and an important sense. Viewed only individ-

ually, as one man among men, and apart from any further relation to other men than that of mere example, we see in Jesus Christ the reality of all that human Salvation can or must be. He was Himself the sanctification, the redemption, and the resurrection — and so in the fullest sense the Salvation — of that humanity which He assumed in His own person. It is perfectly true, if it be rightly meant and rightly understood, to speak of Jesus Christ as having been Himself saved. In Salvation, as predicated of Him, He is both *Salvum faciens* and *Salvus factus* — both God saving and man saved. If we can say of Him that He was sanctified, that He learned obedience and was made perfect, that He was raised from the dead, then we can say that He was saved — for they mean the same thing. But He is more to us than mere "sample or example" of human Salvation.

The humanity of our Lord — all that He was and did in it — all that it has become or been made through His life, death, and resurrection in it — is nearer to every man than the light of mere example could bring it, and more influential in every man than the power of mere example could make it; even though the example be all that His was. Without at present any further explanation or justification, we might simply state the New Testament position in the matter as follows: Our Lord's holiness, righteousness, life (in a word, His Salvation) are ours, not simply in the sense that they were, and are, *human* — that they are *like* ours, or what ours would be. They are ours, *i.e.* not exemplarily merely, but causally. What He is, is not merely ex-

ample of what we should be, but *cause* of what through Him we become. Thus He Himself says: "Ye shall be holy, *for* I am holy"; "*Because* I live ye shall live." And these and many similar sayings are only expressions of a general assumption on His part, and in the mind of the Church after Him, that what He did and became in His humanity, humanity in Him did and became. That is, His own sanctification, perfection, and resurrection were *potentially* those of all men, who were therefore all potentially saved in him. The *potentia*, or power, intended in this assumption, whatever it may be, certainly cannot, as it is understood in the New Testament, be resolved into what we know as the force of example or the infection of enthusiasm.

3d. But again, we must not stop even here if we are to go the full length of the New Testament conception of Salvation through Christ. According to that conception He is not merely the *causa*, but the *res* of our Salvation. We not only are holy *because* He is holy or live because He lives, but *He is* our holiness and our life. Which I would express by saying that He is our holiness, our righteousness, and our life not merely exemplarily, nor merely causally, but *really*. The New Testament intends no mere figure, but literal reality when it speaks of Jesus Christ Himself in us as constituting and being our spiritual life. "*I* live no longer; *Christ* lives in me." says St. Paul; and he means no impersonal example or influence of an absent Christ, but the personal Christ Himself personally present in him. Thus *e.g.* Christianity is for and in every man a resur-

rection and a life; and we arise from death into life not merely *as* Christ did so, nor by consequence merely of His having done so, but because He Himself in us, by His Divine Spirit, becomes our resurrection and our life. We are so personally related to Him and He to us, that in an effectual and real sense His death becomes our death and His resurrection our resurrection, and He Himself in us all that constitutes our Salvation.

The spirit of a man may continue after him, and long after him, to live and operate in his disciples. He being dead, may in a sense continue to live and speak through them. But what is present in them is not in reality *he;* it is only the memory, or at best the impersonal spirit or influence of him. That is not what we mean when we say that Christianity is Christ in us. He does not live in us only as Socrates lived in Plato. He is personally present and lives in the life of every one who lives in Him. "I am the resurrection and the life" means not only that he was His own, but that He is my and every man's resurrection and life. His promise to His disciples before His death to return to them and to be with them to the end of the world, His true disciples ever since have interpreted to mean that no less personally and far more effectually is He now spiritually present in them than once He was physically present among them.

Whether all this can be so, and how it can be so, depends of course upon who and what Christ is. The assumption throughout the New Testament of the relation of Jesus Christ to every man's Salvation,

as Himself personally constituting and being it, carries with it the assumption of His deity. In Him is fulfilled all the Old Testament anticipation or prophecy of *the Lord our Salvation.*

There is a New Testament, not figure but mode of representation, which may bring out more fully the truth under discussion. St. Paul says that "as in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Now if in Adam all die, all must in some sense be in Adam. It is evident upon reflection that the term Adam in the New Testament is used in two senses, an individual and a generic sense. In the passage just quoted, *e.g.*, it is used in the latter. It means "natural humanity," *i.e.* humanity in its actual or what we improperly call its natural condition. I say improperly, because properly the natural condition of a thing is that in which it exists in its true nature; whereas in the improper sense (for which, however, we have warrant in the popular language of Scripture) nature implies that perversion of nature which we call the Fall, and which is called nature not in the sense of its being our true but of its being our actual nature. We cannot avoid such ambiguities as this of viewing sin and death as at once the natural condition and the most unnatural condition of man; but we must keep in mind and make, as occasion requires, the necessary distinction.

The New Testament affirms that in Adam, in our humanity as we receive it from the race, we are all subject to sin and death. This is the fact of the Fall, a fact the truth of which it would seem wholly unnecessary to discuss, because what Christianity

means by it is simply what it is impossible for any man to deny. Any human being who knows himself and knows his condition, knows that he is not by nature and cannot become without Salvation *himself*, according to the Aristotelian definition. That is, himself as defined by his idea and end, his complete spiritual, moral, and natural self. Neither sin nor death are any part of the proper definition and meaning, or of the true law, of manhood. They are the denial, contradiction, and destruction of it. Yet both sin and death are a universal and inevitable part of man's actual or natural condition. Whether or not a man Adam fell, unquestionably man has, because he is, fallen. He is in a condition which is manifestly a fall, and a deep fall, from his proper law and end; and he can be raised up to and made to attain his perfection and destination only through what is for him a Salvation.

But the point at present is what I have called the generic meaning of the name Adam. The head of the race, in whom it originated and of whom it is in a sense the continuation and extension, has given his name to the race. We are all thus *in Adam*, and are all what Adam is. Every one that is born of Adam is born into Adam's nature and condition; which our Lord Himself expressed in the saying, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh."

There are in every human being two parts, the one generic, the other individual and personal. Every man is what he is partly by fact of his nature and partly by act of himself. If there were no natural part there would be no humanity; if there were no

personal part there would be no real manhood, for the characteristic of man as man is personality. What is natural in man is common to all men, because it belongs to the common nature. What is personal in him belongs to himself alone. It may be impossible in much that we are and do to separate between what is our nature and what is ourself, since the nature acts largely through the person and the person can only act within the nature; but we would not distinguish as we do, in consciousness and in our consciences, between what is of necessity and what is of freedom if both did not coexist in us. The Fall, as it is a generic and universal fact, belongs to the nature and not to the personality of man. The weakness of the law to produce human obedience, which means the weakness of human nature to render an obedience to the law, St. Paul describes as a being "weak through the flesh." It is not that the spirit or personality in every man is not willing, but the flesh or common nature is weak. What is called "Original Sin" can only be such an inherited weakness for good or disposition to evil, not in ourselves properly but in our nature, as renders it practically impossible for us, in it as it is, to overcome evil or to do good. The so-called sin of nature only becomes properly ours, and, in fact, only becomes properly sin, when we through the weakness of our nature have yielded a personal obedience to it and have transgressed our law. Before that it is only sin at all as it is the sin of Adam, or the sin previously committed by the race and transmitted to us through the common nature as an inherited and irresistible liability to sin.

Now "as in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive." No one can know his New Testament without knowing how universally and consistently our relation to Christ is represented as a being *in Christ*. The Incarnation is not an individual fact limited to our Lord as a man; it is a generic fact including, or intended to include, in Him the whole race of man. I hope to prove and illustrate at length elsewhere the important truth that *all* that He was and did in the body of His particular incarnation He is and does, or is to be and do, in the greater body of His general or generic incarnation; that as He has glorified humanity in His own individual body, so is He to glorify it in the great body of His saints, who are only such as they are in Him and He in them. This mode of representation so pervades the New Testament that we need only to allude to the numerous descriptions of the Church as the Body of Christ — described also as His πλήρωμα, or fulness, "that which is filled with His presence, power, agency, and riches." Under the influence of this conception of the relation of Christians to Christ, St. Paul utters the prayer: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him (Christ); having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of His calling, what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the Saints, and what the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe according to the working of the strength of His might which he wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the

dead and made Him to sit at His right hand . . . and put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Which means this: That in Jesus Christ we are all in the Incarnation — that is to say, in that system of divine and saving powers and operations which as they wrought mightily in Christ will work mightily in us in Christ, raising us up from the dead, making us victorious over all our spiritual enemies, and seating us at the right hand of God in eternal participation in His holiness and glory.

The point at which we have arrived is this, that as Adam in the New Testament frequently means humanity in Adam or the race, so Christ frequently means humanity in Christ or the Church. There is thus an analogy between our relation to Adam as head of the race and to Christ as head of the Church. But there is also a contrast which it is all-important clearly to understand. Our relation to Adam is a natural one; our relation to Christ is a personal one. We are one with Adam by fact of our nature; we are one with Christ only by act of our persons or of ourselves. Adam is thus the unity of human nature; Christ is a union of human persons. In Adam we are subject to our nature; in Christ our nature is made subject to *us;* that is, freedom and personality are brought to their proper dominion over natural impulse and sensibility. In the language of the New Testament, Adam is that condition in which the σάρξ, the flesh or fallen nature, is dominant over the πνεῦμα, the spirit or personal will of the man. It is a con-

dition consequently of bondage or slavery. Christ is that condition in which the spirit has been enabled to subdue the flesh and so to attain to the freedom and life of holiness and righteousness. And so St. Paul defines Christ as follows: "But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard Him and were taught in Him even as the truth is in Jesus." And then he goes on to tell what is true (*i.e.* what has taken place and takes place) in Jesus Christ; viz. "your putting off, or away, the old man which is corrupt, etc. (*i.e.* the σάρξ or fallen nature), and putting on the new man (*i.e.* your own emancipated and risen spiritual or personal selfhood in Christ), who after God is created in righteousness and holiness." Thus, I repeat, the sarkical, fleshly, or natural man is what he is through unity of nature with Adam; the pneumatical or spiritual man is what he is through personal union with Christ, who is in him that divine not only potentiality but actuality of holiness, righteousness, and eternal life in which alone the spirit or personality of man asserts itself over his flesh or fallen nature. But the personal union of Christians with Christ, and with one another in Christ, which is the true notion of the Church, constitutes a unity as real as that of our nature with Adam and with all men in Adam. In fact, it becomes itself a unity and community, not only of persons but of nature; only, if I may use the expression, not of *natural*, involuntary, or necessary nature, but spiritual, personal, and acquired nature. As St. John represents us as brought in Christ into a κοινωνία, or participation, in the personal life of God, so St.

Peter represents us in the same terms as participating in the divine φύσις, or nature. Here, again, the word nature has to be guarded against more than one ambiguity. We are not of course in Christ partakers of the nature of God in the sense in which we are in ourselves partakers of the nature of Adam. If we were, we should become what God is in His nature, *i.e.* divine. What St. Peter means by the divine nature is not, so to speak, the physical or metaphysical nature of God, but the moral, spiritual, or personal nature of God — not what He is; *e.g.* in the categories of substance, cause, etc., but what he is as holiness, love, etc. In the proper sense of the divine nature we are, of course, incapable of sharing it with God. As designating His personal disposition and character, His mind and spirit and will and purpose, we are capable of being taken into and made subjects of it. In Jesus Christ God took our nature in the proper or natural sense in order that in Him we might be brought into participation with His nature in the secondary or spiritual sense above distinguished — that in it He might become our holiness, our righteousness, and our life, and so make us of one spiritual, moral, and personal nature, disposition, or character with Himself. All this He was in Himself, objectively to our faith; all this He becomes in us, subjectively through our faith.

But when we say that Christianity is a community not only of persons but of nature with Christ, it is meant not only that we are made partakers of the divine nature in the above sense, but of a new human nature through that participation. Through spirit-

ual and personal union with God our nature too is recreated or renewed. So completely so, that in the end, even our natural body is changed into a spiritual body, and physical mortality is swallowed up in a higher and eternal physical life. But while in Adam it is the natural that involves and brings down the spiritual and personal, in Christ it is the spiritual and personal that raises up and restores the natural. "If Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies through His spirit that dwelleth in you."

CHAPTER FOURTH.

OF CHRIST AS OUR RECONCILIATION OR ATONEMENT.

I USE the word Atonement in this chapter, not in the fulness of its modern meaning, but in the sense of its solitary occurrence in the English New Testament (Rom. 5:11), as translation for καταλλαγή, reconciliation or at-one-ment.

Does reconciliation designate only a change in man to Godward, or does it involve a change in God to manward? Does it mean the removal of an ὀργὴ θεοῦ, a wrath of God, which is not a mere anthropomorphism, but represents something real in the nature and disposition of God towards man in his natural condition? Are we in fact "by nature the children of wrath," and does that attitude or disposition of wrath need in God to be converted into one of grace?

I lay down as a position which is capable of being sustained — and which ought never, for one moment, to be abandoned — the following: That Christianity involves essentially no affirmation with regard to God which is not as true *in re*, in the fact and actuality of things, as it is in the word or declaration of revelation. In other words, there is nothing revealed as a necessary part of Christianity which is not, as far as

we can see, corroborated as truth in the reality of things, which is what I mean by *in re*. So when St. Paul says that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness," the revelation he speaks of is one not in word only, but in fact, *in re*. We cannot separate God from the nature and working of things. Things and their working are God, save in the case of the working of that one only thing which God has endowed with the awful power of separating itself from Him in thought, will, and deed; viz. personality. The only thing in the universe capable of being outside of God, is personal consciousness and will; the only thing that is actually outside of Him is *sin*, which is personal separation from and enmity to Him. And even sin is outside of God only in the "form," and not in the "matter" of it. In the sinful act, the sin is outside of Him, but the act is taken up by Him into that "working of things," which is the working of His determinate counsel and foreknowledge, and in which all things work together for good. Thus, in the acts of Pharaoh and Judas the sin as such was theirs, but the acts were made God's, and so were made good. And thus the wicked are God's instruments and the wrath of man is made to praise Him.

But more than this. Not only all the effects and consequences of sin, but particularly the reflex action of sin upon the sinner himself, is part of that working of things which is God Himself. Thus it is true that God hardened Pharaoh's heart. Pharaoh's sin was his own, but its hardening effect upon himself was the working of a natural law, which was not his

doing but God's. And these natural results of sin in the sinner are judicial; they are God's judgments upon sin, God's punishment for sin. Let any one read carefully St. Paul's description in Rom. 1, of *how* the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, and he will see God's wrath revealed *in re*. He will see how by natural consequence, *i.e.* by the necessary working of a law, *unbelief* becomes *disobedience* or *unrighteousness;* and then how disobedience becomes *death*; *i.e.* how transgression against God becomes, or rather is in itself, the violation of man's own nature and law, and so the dissolution, corruption, and death of himself. And in all this we shall see the judicial and punitive consequence of sin. "*Because* they would not have God in their knowledge; because they changed the truth of God into a lie; because, thinking themselves wise, they became fools — *therefore* God gave them over unto unclean and shameful lusts, unto all manner of sins against nature, and *so* they received in themselves that recompense of their error which was due."

"The soul that sinneth it shall die" is no mere word of revelation. It is no arbitrary declaration which has no counterpart in the working of things. It is as true a fact or law of nature as gravitation itself. There are several things to reflect upon in this *real* way of looking at the matter. And first, the relation or connection between sin, the divine displeasure and punishment. The connection is a *real* and an indissoluble one. We might affirm *a priori* with an absolute conviction that any provision for doing

away with the divine wrath and punishment for sin includes as a pre-condition the doing away of sin. Bishop Butler should have taught us *how* God is angry and punishes. With man there is no necessary connection *in re* between these things. Human punishments are always more or less arbitrary and frequently have no natural connection, — I mean in the mode not the fact of their following — whatsoever with the offences for which they are inflicted. But with God sin carries its wrath and its penalty in itself and the three however separable in thought are inseparable in fact. It is impossible in the nature of the thing that God should put away one without putting away all; impossible that *His* ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας should be anything less than a real and a whole putting away of sin; *i.e.* should be only a remission of the penalty or laying aside of the anger and not an actual removal of the sin itself. Of course I am speaking of the order of things in themselves or in God. *We* may or may not apprehend them in a different order. But the great truth of my Salvation in Jesus Christ is *this:* He has abolished sin; He has abolished my sin, therefore there is nothing between me and God, and nothing between me and Eternal Life. He is therefore my καταλλαγή, my reconciliation or at-one-ment.

A little reflection will show us how impossible it is in the nature of the thing that sin should not involve inherently and essentially just what revelation calls divine wrath and penalty. If holiness carries with it in its very nature the divine approbation and blessedness, how shall not its contradictory be in itself the opposite of these? If holiness, righteousness, and

life are in themselves supreme rewards and blessings, how can sin, disobedience, and death be anything else than a corresponding penalty and curse?

The wrath of God properly understood, so far from being in conflict with the love of God, is the highest expression of it. How can God love my good without hating my evil? "Our God is a consuming fire" — but the fire of the furnace which is hatred to the dross is love to the gold. And God's wrath against sin is not only love, but the only love to the sinner. Suppose that spiritual and moral evil were not followed by the natural evil of God's displeasure and punishment. It is not supposable — because, being spiritual and moral beings, spiritual and moral evil are contradictions of ourselves and of our proper good, and consequently are in themselves also natural evils to us. But supposing it supposable, if God could and should remove from sin and disobedience their natural and penal consequences, would it be an act of love on His part to do so? Would goodness continue to be blessedness if badness ceased to be accursedness? "*Our* God is a consuming fire," and He is never so much "our God" as when He is consuming us. The cross is the only true revelation and adequate expression of the love of God, the cross by which He imparts life by inflicting death upon us. For it is only in God's wrath to our sin that we know God's love to ourselves. If, then, God's "working of things" is in itself Divine Love, He cannot change it because we refuse to see it so. It must needs be and continue to be that it is only to those who love Him and are called according to His purpose, *i.e.* who enter into the true

meaning and purpose of His calling, that all things work together for good!

There is, therefore, a true sense in which we are by nature "the children of wrath." Every man born of Adam inherits a σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας — a nature in which he is subject to sin and death. I repeat that this is true *in re*, and not merely by revelation. In fact, revelation makes nothing true; it only reveals what is true. When the Scriptures speak as they do of our being by nature *enemies* of God, we may be disposed to deny, and that with an element of justice, that our consciousness sustains the charge. St. Paul himself is the first to affirm that the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, the inner spiritual man that is in every man, the man in himself or in his personality, is on the side of God and of God's and his own law. But the ἔξω ἄνθρωπος, the outer and fleshly man that is also a part of every man, the man as he is under the dominion of his σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, is *not* subject to the law of God and cannot be. Whether the man himself knows it or means it or not, his life is at enmity with God and His law. The ἔχθρα, or enmity, is therefore essentially a fact of his nature rather than of himself. If it were not so he would not be in the New Testament sense a subject for redemption; because the New Testament redemption is essentially the emancipation of *the man* from the bondage of *his nature*. And what man needs not to be redeemed? Who is there in the flesh that is not under the dominion of sin and death? This, it may be contended, is our enmity against God, not God's against us. So it is, but the ἔχθρα of man involves of necessity the

ὀργή of God. The ἔχθρα of sin brings in it and with it the ὀργή of death. The power, not ourselves, that reveals itself in the working of things, whether we call it nature or God, makes sin a terrible thing to the sinner. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "He that will not live by the law shall die by the law." "To them that are contentious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation, and wrath, tribulation and anguish — upon every soul of man that worketh evil." That may be revelation, but it is the way God reveals Himself in the working of things as well as in the letter of Scripture.

But man's enmity is the ground and cause of God's wrath, and not *vice versa*. "Your sin hath separated between you and your God." As naught else in the universe, possible or conceivable, could have produced or constituted a separation between God and man save only sin, so naught else but the doing away of sin can reconcile or make them one. Nothing less or else than that will make the reconciliation as real a thing as the separation was.

Now Jesus Christ is our reconciliation or at-one-ment, because in Him sin is abolished and the separation done away. And this in a twofold sense — first, in Himself, and second, in us. First, sin is abolished in Christ Himself, in the simple fact that in Him in our nature there is no sin. And there is no sin in Him in our nature because, by His victorious and entire sinlessness in it, He has destroyed sin in it in Himself. He has slain the enmity in our nature, so that in Him we see God and man reconciled and at one. He has accomplished the τί ἦν εἶναι of human

Salvation. He has defined Salvation by His own act and exhibited in it His own person. When we say that Jesus Christ as man, as well as for man, destroyed sin by His own sinlessness, we do not mean that He did do so by His negative sinlessness but by His positive holiness. There is *no* sinlessness but in the most active and positive holiness. "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." It was true of our Lord Himself, as author of our Salvation, that His death in the flesh was in reality His life in the spirit. It was the perfection of His living in God and the spirit that excluded, condemned, and destroyed all possibility of imperfect life in the flesh. Jesus Christ is thus, in Himself, representatively and exemplarily our reconciliation, because He is our not only sinlessness but holiness: because in Him as man all separation between God and man has been taken away, and God and man are one.

But secondly, sin is abolished not only in Christ Himself, but in us in Christ. And that because, as we have seen, He is not exemplarily only, but both causally and really *our* holiness. "Ye know," says St. John, "that He was manifested to take away sin; and in Him is no sin. He that abideth in Him sinneth not." Our Lord's "taking away" sin involves in the Apostle's mind two things: 1st, *in Him* is no sin, and 2d, in *us* in Him (in so far as we *are* and continue in Him) is no sin. Jesus Christ is a *real* Salvation from sin to all who are *really* in Him. "Who," says St. Peter, "His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin

should live to righteousness." Our Lord crucified and destroyed sin in His own flesh that *we* in Him might die in the flesh of sin and live in the spirit of holiness and true righteousness.

"He is our peace," says St. Paul. And He explains it to be because He has broken down the middle wall of partition (not only between Jew and Gentile, but) between us and God. He has in His flesh, which is ours, abolished the enmity in our flesh.

So Jesus Christ is the door of entrance into God. He is the way by which alone we come to the Father. He is the rending of the veil of separation between God and us. And that because, by His abolishment of sin He has actually brought humanity, both in His body natural and in His body mystical, into a real oneness with God.

Real, for us as well as in Himself, as is the reconciliation which our Lord has wrought by the abolition of sin, we have yet to distinguish between the several stages of its application or applicability to ourselves.

In the first place, Jesus Christ was our peace and oneness with God, not only before He becomes subjectively *our* death to sin and life in holiness, but long before even He objectively reconciled us by His own death and resurrection. "Because God hath from the beginning chosen us to Salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth," — "according to His purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ who hath abolished death and brought

life and immortality to light." Most assuredly what was prepared and intended for us from the beginning was that death, and before death sin, was to be abolished not only for us but in us in Christ. In the mind and grace of God we were reconciled and Christ was our reconciliation before the world began.

In the second place, the reconciliation thus eternally ours in the gracious purpose of God, was actualized and revealed in the world when Jesus Christ, by His crucifixion and death in the flesh and His resurrection and life in the spirit, sanctified humanity in His own person and became the author of human holiness. Inasmuch as holiness is the only real reconciliation He thus became our reconciliation — but only as yet in an objective sense; for us but not yet in us. By our Lord's act in the world and among men, He became no longer in God's grace only but in men's faith also, *their holiness*. They were enabled to see in His, their own death to sin and life to God. If Christ were not thus first objectively our Salvation, He could never become subjectively our Salvation. The objective divine gift must precede the subjective human reception of it. If Salvation is through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth, there must be a truth of our Salvation revealed to us which by believing we are saved. The more we study how Jesus Christ becomes or is made our holiness, the more clearly shall we see that He must have been so to us in Himself before He could become so in us in ourselves. We anticipate a great truth when we affirm that *all* God's operations in us as spiritual beings are by the word through the spirit. But assuredly again, Jesus

Christ is objectively our holiness — or our Salvation in any respect — *only* as by His spirit and our faith in Him as such, He is to become so subjectively and actually.

We were sanctified, or reconciled, in Christ Jesus prior to any faith or even knowledge of it on our part. Again, we are sanctified in Christ Jesus in our faith prior to being so in fact; we see ourselves complete in Him in faith while yet we are conscious of being very incomplete in ourselves in fact. But certainly both God's grace and our faith look forward to fact, and they would have no meaning in themselves apart from that fact. But the important question of the relation between objective and subjective Salvation in Christ must be discussed in a chapter to itself.

In the third place, and finally, Christ is our reconciliation and at-one-ment with God in the sense and to the extent that in Him we are more or less actually sanctified, and God and we are actually at one, by our own participation in Christ's death and resurrection, *i.e.* by the death in us of all that separates us, and the life of all that unites us with God. The *rationale* of this process by which Christ becomes our subjective holiness and real reconciliation with God I also reserve for separate treatment.

The place of baptism, as of the Church in general, in its relation to both our objective and subjective Salvation in Christ, I prefer to pass over until we come, at the close, to discuss the nature and function of Church and Sacraments.

From an exegetical point of view, objection might be made to the practical identification of reconcilia-

tion with sanctification or holiness, which is made in this chapter — upon the theory that reconciliation cannot stop short of what I have called a real reconciliation, a bringing of man into real oneness with God. It might be said that in the New Testament, while holiness always means a subjective nature, quality, or character, reconciliation is an objective relation between God and man, brought about once for all and independently of us by the fact of Christ's death. For example, in Rom. 5:10, etc., the Apostle says: "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son; much more, being or having been reconciled, shall we be saved by His life; and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the atonement, or reconciliation." But not to go at present into a detailed exegesis of the passage, I think that what is in the mind of St. Paul might be paraphased thus: If when we were yet enemies God objectively saved us in Christ, by abolishing in Him the enmity, why should we doubt that He will subjectively save us in Christ by abolishing in us the enmity? What has been done for us, why shall it not be done in us? If God, while we were yet in enmity, prepared for us in Christ, in *His* crucifixion of the flesh and abolishment of the enmity, an objective reconciliation or at-one-ment, how can we doubt that, through our union with Christ and by the grace of Christ through our faith, God working in us with the selfsame power with which He wrought in Christ will make that objective subjective and do *in*

us ourselves that which for the very purpose He has done *for us* in Christ! The reconciliation for us is only a means and a step to the reconciliation in us, a presentation to our faith as having taken place in Christ of that which through our faith is to take place in ourselves.

Again, in 2 Cor. 5 : 17, etc., St. Paul cries: "If any man is in Christ Jesus he is a new creation; the old things have passed away, and behold, new things have come to pass (in him). And it is all of God who *reconciled* us to Himself by Jesus Christ." Here, as throughout the passage, the reconciliation which took place in Christ is represented as taking place in us by the death in us as in Him of the enmity in our flesh. By a real participation in His death the old things of the flesh have passed away; by participation in His life the new things of the spirit have come to pass in us.

"God," the Apostle goes on to say, "was in Christ *reconciling* the world unto Himself." This means first, of course, that God was in Jesus Christ personally, by his own act upon the cross, reconciling the world. Potentially and in the intention of the divine grace, *every man* on that cross died to sin and was reconciled to God. But that the reconciliation thus effected in Christ was to be also effected in us is proved by the Apostle's going on to say, further, "And hath committed unto us the ministry or ministering of the reconciliation." In the prosecution of which, He says, "As ambassadors for Christ and as though God was beseeching you by us, we entreat you for Christ's sake *be ye reconciled* to God." Now this, *our being*

reconciled to God, no doubt means that we are to accept in faith the fact of an objective reconciliation in Christ. But it does not mean that *only;* it means that we are to receive through faith the fact of a subjective reconciliation also, so as not only *to have been made one* but *to be one* with God in Christ. I say that this must be so because just above the Apostle, as we have seen, has described the effect of the reconciliation to be a change, a new creation, the passing away of old things, and the coming about of new things *in us.*

It is a mistake to think that sanctification means only something subjective, and reconciliation only something objective in the New Testament. Jesus Christ was in Himself, and before we ever knew Him so, as much our sanctification as He was our reconciliation. "He became wisdom to us from God, both righteousness and *sanctification* and redemption," long before any baptism into Him, or faith in Him, or reception of any spiritual quality or character from Him on our part. We were ἡγιασμένοι ἐν Χριστῷ, sanctified in Christ, prior to any actual sanctity in ourselves. He was thus objectively, and in Himself, our sanctification before, through His grace and our faith, He became so subjectively in us. And as sanctification is not subjective only, so as we have seen reconciliation is not objective only.

In fact we may say, that while there are some things which Jesus Christ is represented predominantly as having done objectively for us — as *e.g.* justification, redemption, reconciliation, etc. — and other things which He is represented as doing sub-

jectively in us — as sanctification — yet it is true that He was or did *nothing* for us which He was not to be or do in us, and He is or does nothing in us which He was not or did not first for us.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

OF CHRIST AS OUR REDEMPTION.

REDEMPTION bears the same relation to righteousness which, we have seen in the previous chapter, reconciliation bears to holiness. There is no real reconciliation but holiness, for the reason that as sin is the only separation from God and enmity with Him, so holiness is the only union and oneness with Him of which we are capable. And in the same way there is no redemption but righteousness, because righteousness is the only freedom of a moral being, and all unrighteousness is bondage or slavery; and redemption means deliverance from bondage or bringing into freedom.

As reconciliation and holiness have to do with the spiritual nature of God, so redemption and righteousness have to do with the moral law of God. Reconciliation or at-one-ment brings us into that personal and spiritual oneness of nature with God which we call holiness. Redemption brings us into that freedom of obedience to God's law which we call righteousness. The principle of holiness is faith, which is that human correspondence with and susceptibility of the divine through which we become partakers of

the divine spirit and nature; the principle of righteousness is obedience, which is that human activity in the divine whereby we realize the divine will or law. Human holiness and righteousness may not be separable in fact: in fact they are one, as soul and body are one. For it is at once man's highest law, obedience, and righteousness to be one with God, and his highest oneness with God or holiness to fulfil God's mind or will or law. But the two things are separable in thought and the distinction we have made between them has at least this use, that it enables us better to understand human Salvation by considering it from different points of view and as it is expressed in different sets of terms. So, as we have considered Salvation as a restoration to oneness of spiritual nature with God, we are now to study it as deliverance from a condition of bondage and restoration to the liberty of obedience to God's law.

I have already defined liberty to be the freedom of a person, not from law, but to obey his law. Everything that is or lives has its law — which is at once God's law, nature's law, and its own law. There is no schism or difference among these. To obey or to transgress one is to obey or transgress all, for they are all one. God or nature demands nothing more or less of any being than to fulfil itself. And this it can do only by obeying its law, for the law of any being is nothing but the expression of its own proper and perfect acting and being, and so self-realization. I can only be, act, and become *myself* in obedience to my own law. To obey any *other* law is to depart from and so deny, contradict,

and cease to be *myself*. To do which is to contradict not only God's, nature's, and one's own law, but the good of all these. It is at once unholiness, unrighteousness, and death. Obedience to one's own law, therefore, is holiness, righteousness, and life, and disobedience is the opposite of all these.

Now as matter of fact, disobedience is a universal condition of the human race. I say *condition*, because in every man in this world disobedience, or transgression of law, has its origin and cause not in himself but in his nature. Its very universality and inevitableness is proof that it is in us by consequence and necessity of our fallen nature. As St. Paul says: "It is not I but sin that dwelleth in me," *i.e.* in my σάρξ, or fallen nature. As for the "I," by which he means the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, the personal selfhood, that is in, and *is*, every man — St. Paul affirms that *that* recognizes, acknowledges, approves, desires, and wills the law. Nevertheless "I," who know and will the law, do not obey it. Why? Because I am in bondage to my σάρξ, or fallen nature. The higher will of spiritual and moral reason is subject to the lower will of carnal inclination, and the law is trampled under foot of our lusts. Who is free from this bondage, or who is able of himself to emancipate himself from it? Alas! He who thinks that he can knows neither the whence nor the whereunto of his Salvation; he knows neither the height from which, nor the depth to which he is fallen. Who can ascend into heaven and raise himself thither; who can descend into hell and raise himself thence? The more a man is saved the more he knows the depths

from which and the heights to which man needs to be saved, and the more he discovers that for him Salvation is of God and not of himself.

There is, of course, a paradox in the position that man *ought* to render an obedience which he *cannot*. But both the *ought* and the *cannot* express facts of moral experience which are not to be gainsaid, whether or not we are able to reconcile or explain them. The scriptural account assumes that the *cannot* ought not to exist. Its existence is the result of sin, and constitutes that bondage to sin which the race has entailed upon itself. If there were no sin, man would still not *in himself* be able to fulfil his law, for his law is to fulfil himself not in himself but in God. But if there were no sin, man would be in God and so would be able to fulfil himself. When or how the human race fell under the bondage of sin, as an historical question, need not enter into our present discussion. As matter of fact, *is* it under the bondage of sin? That Adam fell need for our present purpose mean only that man is fallen. And that means nothing more than this, that in our present state or condition no man fulfils or is able to fulfil his law. That surely is not a normal condition of things, but it is the actual condition of things. And if freedom or liberty means ability to obey and actual obedience to, one's law, then man is in a state of bondage or slavery, for he has not that ability and is not in that obedience.

The New Testament position that in every man the personal will, which is the person himself, is in bondage under the σάρξ, or fallen nature, is a truth which has been abundantly recognized outside of Christianity.

Perhaps it might be better expressed by saying that the person, or man, finds himself the subject of two wills, one of his moral reason or true law, and the other of his carnal or sensuous nature. Kant holds that since the higher *ought* to control the lower will, therefore it *can* ("I ought, therefore I can"). How can a person recognize as his law that which he cannot obey, *know* that he ought to do what he cannot do? But what, according to Kant himself, *is* the moral law? It is as high and limitless as the "starry heavens." There is no height beyond which there are not higher heights of moral obedience. The only limit to it has been fixed by Him who alone has voiced the possibilities and the aspirations of humanity, the full hungering and thirsting of the human will after righteousness: "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." And indeed for the spiritual and moral activity of man there is no limit in the constitution of human personality short of God Himself. Was ever man so wise and so good that he ought not to and could not be wiser and better, or shall there ever be, short of the divine wisdom and goodness! Truly the Apostle may well pray "that the eyes of our understanding may be enlightened, that we may know the hope of our calling and the riches of the glory of our inheritance"—for what is man's subjection to so infinite, divine, and perfect a law but a promise and a prophecy to him of his own divine and infinite perfection?

But if the moral law means so much, we need to examine well into the ground of Kant's faith that "we ought and therefore we can." In the first

place, assuming the "can," that the fact of the law proves the possibility of the obedience — may it not mean, not according to Kant, man's infinite perfectibility in and of himself, but, according to St. Paul and our Lord, man's infinite perfectibility in and of God? When we say, as we do, that man can realize his moral only as he has realized his spiritual nature; that without holiness there can be for us no righteousness; without God *in* us there can be no true and perfect obedience to God *from* us or *by* us — we are saying nothing that contradicts the nature of obedience or righteousness. On the contrary, the claim that man can realize an infinite and eternal divine law is only rendered credible by the fact that he may be in union with and a partaker of the spirit and power of the infinite and eternal Divine Personality.

In the second place, may we not reconcile Kant's "can" and St. Paul's "cannot," by saying that ideally we can, but actually we cannot render a real obedience to the law. If man were according to his idea he could obey; that is, if he were in perfect correspondence with God, which means, if he were in perfect faith and in perfect grace — he could be and would be in perfect obedience or righteousness. But the relation between God and man is impaired; and as a fact of his actual condition he feels both that he ought to, and ought to be able to, obey — and that he does not, and is not able to, obey. This inability is our bondage, and it is that from which we need to be redeemed. But there cannot be moral redemption or righteousness without spiritual reconciliation or holiness.

It is a vital position in the New Testament doctrine that while the law of any being is the expression of its perfection — while, therefore, it is only perfect as it fulfils its law — yet "the law makes nothing perfect." That is, though the law perfects formally, it cannot do so causally or even instrumentally. Man can never be made perfect by mere command to be, or knowledge that he ought to be, perfect. And that is as far as mere law can go. The meaning and reason of this it is well to reflect upon, even at the risk of the repetition of points already insisted upon.

In the first place, however it may be with other beings, so far as man is concerned, the principle that he cannot be perfected by the operation upon him of mere law is an essential and not an accidental one. It is not the result of the fact of the fall and the consequent ἀσθένεια, or weakness of his nature. Admitting that men might conceivably have been so constituted as to be subject to an abstract formal law whose categorical imperative and their own sense of obligation to it could and would be sufficient to produce their obedience to it — in which case, of course, their perfection as moral beings would have consisted in this mere formal obedience: admitting, I say, that men *might* have been so constituted, as matter of fact they have not been and they are not so constituted. Man's law is *God's* law, and man by the actual constitution of his nature is, or is to be, related to God, not by the external bond of a formal obedience to His law, but by the internal bond of a real and personal union with Himself. This I have endeav-

ored to express by saying that man is not merely a moral but primarily a spiritual being; that he can fulfil his law only in personal and spiritual union with God. He is essentially not a servant but a son of God, called to share His nature as well as obey His law, and only able to obey His law as he first shares His nature. As our Lord in the revelation to us in Himself of a true human sonship, says of Himself, "I and my Father are one," and then adds, as a necessary consequence: "what the Father doeth the Son doeth likewise"—so is it true of us, that it is only as God and we are one, that we work the works of God. We must, by a birth from above, be what God is before we can do what God does.

It is true that, if we wish to speak φυσικώτερον, to go more into the root of things, man being constituted as we have described, *his law* is to be a son and not a servant, and to render a filial and real and not a servile and formal obedience, and therefore it is still by obedience to his law that he is to be perfected. But it makes a great difference whether we make our obedience the cause or the consequence of what we are: even all the difference of whether what we are to be is to be of ourselves or of God. If we are to be perfect by our obedience, then we shall have produced our perfection; we "by our works" shall have earned both it and its recognition and reward from God. If, on the contrary, we can only obey because we are perfect, *i.e.* out of the divine perfection in Jesus Christ into which we are taken, and which is made ours in Him; and because we are and act of and in God in Christ, *i.e.* obey because

we are sons — then our obedience or righteousness is not our own, but God's in us, and it becomes an obedience not of the law but of grace. It is to be admitted again that this is possible only upon condition that God's being and acting in us is consistent with, and in no sense or degree contradictory or destructive of, our own personal being or acting. For it is true that only *my* obedience is in me obedience at all. An obedience only of God in me, and not of me, is no obedience. But why may not my obedience be both of God and of me? If it is my spiritual and personal constitution and nature to become and be my conscious, free, spiritual, and moral self *only* in God, *i.e.* in the relationship of grace and faith, then it is impossible for me to become or be so out of Him. And when I am so in and of Him, I am not contradicting but fulfilling my proper and true selfhood. For while we cannot be ourselves without God, yet we can *not* be ourselves in Him. While we have no positive power of obedience save as He is and acts in us; yet we have the negative power of non-obedience, *i.e.* of not being and acting in Him. So that even God cannot save us, or be our obedience and righteousness, without us: because whatever He might be in us, without us, would not be *our* obedience or righteousness.

It follows from the above that the inability of mere formal law to perfect us is independent of the fact of the Fall. Only God Himself can perfect us, although He perfects us only as He fulfils His law in us and we fulfil our law in Him. But in the second place, the position that the law cannot perfect us becomes

doubly true when we take into account that fact of our nature as it is, which we call the Fall.

If we were only incomplete, or not yet perfect, we should yet have to find our τελέιωσις, or completion, in God. But because we have not only not yet fulfilled the law of perfection, but are subject to a law of imperfection, we need to find in God not only completion but redemption — not only τελείωσις but ἀπολύτρωσις.

In proportion as man knows his own, which is God's, law; knows what it requires of him and what he is as compared with and judged by it, in that proportion does he recognize in the law the ministration to him not of life but of death. Instead of producing in him righteousness, it can only convict and convince him of unrighteousness. At the best, as we have seen, the law, while it exacts righteousness, is unable to impart that grace, that divine nature, that holiness without which all so-called righteousness is a body without a soul. But here it exacts righteousness not only without itself supplying the necessary holiness, but of those who are already in themselves unholy. Its only possible effect is to reveal the condition of things without in any way bettering it. "By the law is the knowledge of sin"; but if the knowledge of sin means the knowledge of our helplessness and hopelessness under the power and law of sin, then instead of making things better it can only make them worse. The revelation to the sinner of his sin, if it cannot cure, will only aggravate and intensify his sinfulness. Simply to make sin more conscious is to make it more sinful and malignant.

more desperately active and wicked. To preach only the law to fallen man, then, inasmuch as it is only to increase his guilt and condemnation, is but a ministry of wrath.

Thus is the gospel the diametrically opposite procedure from the law. It cannot require anything less of us than a perfect obedience or righteousness, because nothing less would be for us real redemption and moral freedom. But it does not undertake to produce righteousness by requiring or demanding it. It comes to us not law foremost, but God foremost, making not obedience the condition of God in us, but God in us the condition and cause of obedience. It says: Believe, and let God *be* in you, and *then* obey or let God act or work in you; or rather, then *will* God act in you and you in God; your holiness will become righteousness.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon certain narrower senses in which the law is spoken of occasionally in the New Testament. It sometimes means the law in the letter, as it is formulated in a moral code or a system of outward precepts. Sometimes again, the ceremonial law, — the law as it had been embodied in the symbolism of rites and ceremonies. Of course in neither of these senses can the law make any man perfect. No formal observance of moral precepts or ritual acts can cleanse his conscience or consciousness of sin or guilt, or impart to him that holiness and righteousness which as his only spiritual and moral perfection can alone constitute for him Salvation.

Before passing away from the subject we may lay

down another ground of the impossibility of a righteousness through the law, which seems in one or more passages to be in the mind of St. Paul. It may be expressed in the paradox that a righteousness, if it could be and were attained though the law, would in the most essential respect of all, *not* be a righteousness. That is, it would lack the distinctive element of Christian righteousness at least, of which the essential element is humility. St. Paul, after describing the righteousness which is of God in Christ, in contrast with that which is of the law, seems to make the specific glory of it to consist in the fact that all *boasting* is excluded from it. It is true that in the moral axiom, "He who exalts himself abases himself," the meaning must be not he who exalts himself in fact, but in thought or feeling. For there is no real spiritual or moral exaltation which is not in a true and proper sense a *self*-exaltation. Though it be God who exalts us, yet as we have seen He cannot exalt us without ourselves, or except as we exalt ourselves. But in any exaltation which is purely of oneself, may we not affirm that the fact of self-exaltation is inseparable from the sense or feeling of self-exaltation? Can there be a purely self-made virtue, or self-righteousness which is not only free from moral or spiritual pride, but possesses the opposite charm and glory of a true modesty and humility? What St. Paul seems to value so highly in the righteousness of Christ, is that while it is a most real righteousness, an actual fulfilment by ourselves of our law, yet the fact that it is at the same time not of ourselves, but of God in us, excludes from it all that

element of boasting, of self-conceit and pride which would contradict its chief virtue and beauty; viz. its selflessness, its modesty and humility. Assuredly to be all that righteousness is and to do all that it requires, and yet to take none of the merit or glory of it to ourselves, makes righteousness a vastly better and greater thing than if it were otherwise. What else could combine such lofty assurance, such divine confidence of being able to be all things and to do all things, with such meekness and lowliness, such humility and modesty, as we see originally in our Lord Himself, as we see derivatively in St. Paul and in all true Christians!

Returning now to the facts of the case, we find that man is not in obedience to the true law which personally he himself recognizes and wills and in which he would find the freedom of righteousness and life, but that, on the contrary, he is subject to a false counter-law, whose seat is in his flesh and which the Apostle calls "the law of sin and death." Of course this law of sin in the flesh is no proper *law*. In one sense, indeed, it is a law and a divine law, inasmuch as even sin, though as such originating and existing only outside of God, yet when it does exist, is subject in its workings and consequences to a law imposed upon it by God. For example, the connection expressed in the very words "sin *and* death" reveals a law of things, and therefore of God; the law, namely, that the cause sin, and the effect death, are indissolubly connected or united in one. Thus every sinner is inextricably involved in a train of natural and necessary consequences which operate as a law

to which he is subject and from which he needs to be redeemed. And this law, in so far as it is natural and judicial, is divine; it is the working of the ὀργὴ θεοῦ, the wrath of God. But properly, a law is the true law of a thing, and the only law for man is the law of righteousness. The law of sin and death is a false law, contradicting in him the true law of holiness, righteousness, and life, and constituting for him a slavery or bondage in the fact that it contradicts what is alone and essentially his freedom.

Knowing, then, what man's bondage is and what his freedom would be, we are prepared to anticipate what his redemption must be. It would be impossible, however, to express this more exactly than St. Paul has done in the beginning of the eighth chapter of Romans. "There is, therefore, now," says he, "no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, for the law of the Spirit of life hath in Christ Jesus set me free from the law of sin and death." The law of sin and death includes two things. 1st, the fact that every man who is in the flesh sins and is the slave of sin; that, however in the spirit he may know, desire, and will otherwise, in the flesh he obeys and does it. 2d, the fact that in sin we are brought under a train of natural, penal, or judicial consequences which works with the necessity, certainty, and regularity of a law, which consequently is called the law of sin and death and which constitutes that κατάκριμα, or "condemnation," which is the working *in re* of the ὀργὴ θεοῦ.

Now in "Christ Jesus" the condemnation is abolished because the law of the spirit of life which is in

Him sets us free from this counter-law of sin and death. The "spirit of life" is the spirit of holiness and righteousness which is, in itself, emancipation from sin and unrighteousness and by consequence from death. It is not a mere human spirit of natural obedience to the higher law of righteousness manifested in Jesus Christ. It is the personal, divine spirit which wrought in Christ Himself without measure; and which, if we be in Christ, works in us to make us spiritual, *i.e.* to enable us in the spirit to overcome the flesh of sin that is in us. "If the spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwell in us, He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will quicken us also by His spirit that dwelleth in us." The law of the spirit of life in us in Christ can only mean the spirit of God in Christ making Christ's holiness, righteousness, and life *ours*, and so effecting in us a real and the only real emancipation or redemption from the law of sin and death, the natural operation in us of which is God's *κατάκριμα*, or condemnation. "For," the Apostle goes on to say, "what was impossible for the law to do, God, sending His Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law (or that righteousness which the law requires of us) might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." The law requires righteousness of us; but to require *of* is the opposite of giving *to*. It implies that righteousness is to be of *our* obedience and not of *God's* spirit and gift, *i.e.* a merely moral and not an essentially spiritual righteousness. It implies, further,

not only that we could if unfallen acquire, but that we can, though fallen, recover righteousness; that not only righteousness but redemption from unrighteousness is to be our own act in or upon ourselves. This is a double impossibility; not only could not the law if we were upright, but it doubly cannot because we are fallen, produce in us its own righteous requirement. It can only work in us, not δικαίωμα but κατάκριμα.

But what the law in our flesh and especially in our sinful flesh could not accomplish, God, sending His own Son in our flesh, did and does accomplish. He *did* accomplish it when Jesus Christ by that sole instrument of human Salvation, the Cross, *i.e.* by His perfect crucifixion of the flesh of sin, condemned sin in the flesh, broke the power, abolished the sway, abrogated the law, and did away with all the consequences of sin in the flesh.

He *does* accomplish it when in us in Christ, with the self-same spirit and power and effect with which He wrought in Christ Himself, He enables our spirit to subdue and mortify our flesh, and substitutes in us the law of the spirit of life for that of sin and death; and so fulfils in us that righteousness which the law requires, but was unable to produce in us.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

OF CHRIST BOTH OBJECTIVELY AND SUBJECTIVELY, OUR REDEMPTION AND RIGHTEOUSNESS.

THE word δικαιόω, after the analogy of verbs of its form — as δουλόω, to enslave, τυφλόω, to blind — means properly to *make righteous*. A number of these verbs, however, when applied to human, or any short of creative, agency, cannot have this directly causative force. Thus ὁμοιόω, to liken, means ordinarily not to make but to pronounce like; and ἀξιόω, not to make, but to hold, or regard as, worthy. The reason of which is that the words in their proper force would designate a causative agency of which we are incapable. So, as applied to us, δικαιόω cannot mean to make δίκαιος. It can only mean either to recognize as, or to pronounce righteous one who is so; or else to treat as righteous one who is not so. In the latter sense, *e.g.* one possessing the authority and power to do so might, upon certain objective grounds, remit the guilt and penalty of an offence and so, as we say, do away with the offence, and make the offender no longer such. But this is only making the offence and the offender *as though they were not*, it is not really making them *not*, what they are. That is as

far as our making, or causative agency, can go. So when God, on the objective ground of what Jesus Christ has done and is, is represented as δικαιῶν τὸν ἄδικον — if the expression is to be interpreted as it would have to be if applied to human agency, it must mean only that He judicially puts away his unrighteousness and treats him as though he were righteous. I do not mean to say that there is nothing like this in God's treatment of us in Jesus Christ. But I do think that it is well to remember that in passing from speaking of ourselves to speaking of God, we pass into the consideration of a very different sort of causative agency. And when we are endeavoring to penetrate beneath the anthropomorphisms of mere popular speech, and look at the divine working as it is, it is still more important that we should remember it. When, therefore, we say that God views us and treats us in Jesus Christ as though we were what Christ is, and that, prior to our being in any sense what Christ is, that expresses, of course, a very great, gracious, and precious truth. And it is, moreover, I admit, on God's part treating our unrighteousness as though it were not, and us as though we were righteous when we are not. And yet the essential truth of God's δικαιοῦν τὸν ἄδικον, justifying the unrighteous, in Christ is not merely a pronouncing but a making righteous. God in Christ only calls, and treats us as righteous, because in Christ He makes us righteous, and He only treats our unrighteousness as though it were not, because as we shall see He causes it not to be.

The order and relation of the successive steps by

which God in Christ becomes our redemption and righteousness is all-important, and it is necessary for us here to treat it with the greatest care.

In the first place, Jesus Christ is Himself ὁ δίκαιος, the righteous one. "He became, or was made, to us from God righteousness." He is God's revelation to us of human righteousness; He illustrates in His person "what it were" for man to be righteous. He is, then, first, I repeat, objectively to us and in Himself *what righteousness is* — the incarnate expression of it. If our Lord were no more He would still be thus to us our divine and, at the same time, our most truly human model or exemplar. He would be, in the highest sense, a *law* to us, the perfect expression of what we ourselves ought to be and do. I have said before that Jesus Christ is so true to us because He is so perfectly the truth of us. We recognize by the instinct of a true humanity that He is the very truth of humanity. But in all this our Lord would be *only* a law to us; the object of our obedience, imitation, aspiration, but in no real sense the object of our *faith;* unless by faith we mean faith in ourselves, the confidence and assurance that we not only ought to be, but can make ourselves what He is. But even our Lord Himself was what He was, as man, by faith not in Himself but in God. His own righteousness was one not of law or of works or of Himself, but of God through faith. And so *our* righteousness is not to be made by us through obedience, but to be received by us through faith. And faith must have an object, an assurance from without, which it responds to and which makes it or consti-

tutes it faith. Moreover, the object of our faith must be something which we ourselves are to attain or to become through faith. Otherwise it may be an object of knowledge, of contemplation, of desire, of anything else, but not of faith. Faith is in something *we* are to have or to be. The proper and only ground of the assurance of faith, that upon which alone it can rest immutably and in which alone it can trust infallibly — because it is itself alone essential truth and faithfulness and certainty — is the *Word of God*. In Old and New Testament, as in the nature of things, the correlative of man's faith is God's Word. In how many ways soever the Word of God is revealed to us, pre-eminently and perfectly is it so in Him who is its incarnation. Jesus Christ is God's revelation to us of ourselves; and of ourselves not merely as we are, but as we ought and are to be; *i.e.* of his disposition, purpose, and predestination of us, and of what in these we are to become. Thus is He the divine not only revelation but promise to us of ourselves. And it is this last which constitutes Him the proper object of our faith.

But the New Testament exhorts us to see in Christ not merely the revelation and promise of *what* we are to be in Christ, but a direct and visible exhibition, ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ, or in operation, of the divine grace and power by which we are to be it. Thus St. Paul prays that we may be enlightened to know not only what is the hope of our calling and the riches of the glory of our inheritance in Christ, but also what the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe according to that working of the strength

of His might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead.

If, then, the human righteousness of Christ is God's Word, God's revelation and promise, to us of our own righteousness; if it is God's proof, assurance, and pledge of the grace and operation by which, as Christ Himself was righteous, so we by the faith of Him objectively and the spirit of Him subjectively, shall in Him be righteous also; then assuredly we have in Jesus Christ ground for the fullest assurance and certainty of faith.

Thus is Christ's righteousness not only the object of our obedience, but the object of our faith. And the essence of our faith in it is this: that we look upon it as, in the divine purpose, promise, and grace, *ours*. Jesus Christ is so the very divine grace itself in operation, that in Him — who is God's not only holiness but sanctification, not only righteousness but righteousing or making righteous, not only life but regeneration and resurrection — we see ourselves sanctified and redeemed and risen and saved.

But the order or sequence of things in our making righteous is this: It is *first* in the divine mind and purpose, and that from the beginning. The force of this position, so insisted upon in the New Testament, is that the fact and character of man's Salvation has its root and ground primarily in the very nature and character of God Himself. The definition of God involves the destiny of man. That in Himself God is Holiness, Righteousness, and Life, and that to us He is Love, Wisdom, and Power, contains within itself the whole story of Incarnation

and Redemption. We may say reverently that if human Salvation were not what it is it would make or prove God different from Himself. We are saved as we are, because God is what He is. And so our destination in Christ has been determined from the beginning.

Then, *secondly*, in the actual process of our making righteous, there are two parts. 1st, God's giving or grace; and 2d, our receiving or faith. The full meaning of grace and faith, and their correlation, require a fuller separate treatment. But the essence of these two might be thus stated: Grace is the mode of the divine operation upon *persons*, as distinguished from *things;* and faith is the condition in *persons* of the divine operation in or upon them. Grace differs from other forms of power, in that it is an operation upon persons, not things; and that therefore it must be an operation upon them through themselves, *i.e.* through their consciousness, their will, their own free activity. Grace is therefore not, like other power, necessary in its effects, but contingent upon the conscious will and the willing obedience, that is, upon the faith, of its subject or recipient. While faith is the condition and *sine qua non* of any actual operation in us of grace, grace, on the other hand, is the ground or cause and presupposition of faith. Grace is therefore the *prius* of faith; that which is to be believed must *be* before it can be believed; the gift and the giving must precede the receiving and the reception. On the other hand, from the very meaning and nature of grace, the giving can only be *through*, and the receiving *by*, that faith which is the

conscious, voluntary, personal act and activity of the recipient. But all such operation upon persons, *i.e.* all grace working through faith, must of course be *ab extra ad intra*. That which is to be wrought *through* the consciousness or intelligence, and the will, and the free being and doing, or personal spiritual activity of the subject, must first in some way be presented *to* all these. How, in the true sense of grace and faith, could God's righteousness become ours through these, except as, first, an objective righteousness given, and then, secondly, a subjective righteousness received?

Returning, then, to the order of our divine "righteousing," or making righteous; as it originates first in the eternal character and intention of God, so the second stage in the process of it must be the objective presentation *to our faith* of the δικαιωσύνη θεοῦ, which is to be made ours through faith. This has been done for us in the person of Jesus Christ, who is not only God's redemption and righteousness for us, but God Himself, our redemption and righteousness. When we say that in Jesus Christ a divine redemption and righteousness is given to us and is ours, we must discriminate between a sense in which this is true and another sense in which it is not true. It is in one sense *already* given to us, and *already* ours; and it is in another sense *not yet* given to us, nor ours. Objectively, it is *given*, and therefore truly ours; subjectively, it is not yet *received*, and therefore not yet truly ours. There is no difficulty or paradox in this, but only what must necessarily be in the order and sequence of things. What I have called a *real*

δικαιοῦν, or *making* righteous of us, must from the very nature of us be a gradual and slow process. The idea and ideal of a divine righteousness can only by degrees elevate and educate our moral and spiritual faculties and understanding to apprehend it; the beauty and attractiveness of such a moral and spiritual ideal can only gradually draw out and almost itself create the higher affections and desires which it is to fill and satisfy; the control and regulation of the will, the slow formation of habits and building up of character require time. In a word, if the being made, or becoming, righteous is to be in accordance with the nature and laws of the human intelligence, will, and faculties in general, instantaneous righteousness is an impossibility. God Himself cannot, by power working necessarily and immediately, work a righteousness in us, for then it would be no more a righteousness than the straightness of a stick or the movement of a falling body is a righteousness. A righteousness is the rectitude or the right movement or action of a personality acting personally; *i.e.* in accordance with the law of intelligence, freedom, and free obedience. If righteousness, then, is God working with us by grace, and not upon us by mere power, God will work in us in it only as *we* can and do work, and that will be by a process of gradual becoming.

But meanwhile *how* does God so work upon and in us? How indeed but by His Word and through our faith? It is the objective Word of us and Word to us which God holds up to us in Jesus Christ, which is the ground and cause and object of our faith and

so the instrument of God's grace. It is my faith in what *Christ* is that will make *me* what Christ is. "His name, through faith in His name, hath made this man every whit whole." But the name is but the designation of what one *is*, and so I paraphrase the passage in its higher spiritual meaning thus: "What Jesus Christ is through our faith in what He is will make *us* what He is." The theory of the New Testament is that we cannot obey unto righteousness, but can only believe unto righteousness. Through obedience we make ourselves righteous, through faith God makes us righteous. The essence and content of my faith is that accepting Christ for what He divinely and infallibly means to me, I see myself made and become righteous in him. I take Him as God's revelation, assurance, and pledge of what I am to be through faith in Him. This leads necessarily to a twofold relation on our part to the righteousness of Christ — a relation in faith and a relation in fact. And no one can have at all entered into, especially St. Paul's point of view, without being familiar with it. Side by side with him is the truth that in Jesus Christ we are dead, risen, ascended, and perfected, in a word, in full possession of a finished Salvation; and the other, no less truth, that we are yet, daily, and more and more every day, to be dying, rising, ascending, and being perfected; in a word, that we are in a state of incomplete and progressive Salvation. Virtually, potentially, in the infallible grace, and most sure Word of God, which is Jesus Christ, all this has taken place for us. To faith (as *e.g.* to Abraham's faith in God's promise of a seed, Rom. 4.) God's

Word is the so sure warrant and assurance of its fulfilment that what He says *is;* it is the substance of things hoped for. And so in faith and in its language all that is true of Christ is said of us; we are all that he has become, risen, ascended, complete, blessed with all spiritual blessing in heavenly places. But it is only in faith that this is wholly already true; in fact, it is not yet so; it is only wholly *to be* true.

The word ἀπολύτρωσις, redemption, thus, while always meaning the same thing, yet in different connections so expresses this from different points of view as to seem to have different meanings. Thus "the redemption of the body" (Rom. 8:23) can only mean the actual deliverance of the body from its present bondage of corruption. "The day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30) must mean the last day, as that on which the redeeming work of our Lord will be completed in the actual deliverance of us from all sin and death. And so in general in this sense redemption means what I have called *real* or actual redemption from the fact of sin and death; that is, it means holiness, righteousness, and life. And yet, more commonly in the New Testament our redemption is represented as something which has been accomplished for us prior to and independently of anything's being thus accomplished in us. In the objective fact of Christ's death and resurrection we are said to have been and to be redeemed long before any real or subjective redemption could have begun in ourselves. But what is that objective fact of Christ's death and resurrection? And how or in what sense is it our redemption? Is not Jesus Christ the

objective revelation to us of the redeeming grace of God, *ἐν ἐνεργειᾳ*, at work or in operation? Is not the end and result of this redeeming grace manifested in what humanity has become, or been made, in the person of Christ, viz. freed from all bondage of sin and death and in the liberty of a divine holiness, righteousness, and life? Do we not see first in Him who is the first-born from the dead, the Captain of Salvation, the perfecter of faith and obedience, the Lord of life; do we not see first in His humanity the manifested meaning, the realized idea of human redemption; is He not *man θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*; in other words, that death in the flesh and life in the spirit, which is human redemption; and is He not the revelation to us both in its divine cause and in its human effect of a divine power, operation, and process begun in Him *only to be* carried on and completed in us in Him? As the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it: "We see *not yet* ourselves, but we see him" complete in all that constitutes a real human Salvation and redemption. But His completion means, and it has no meaning *unless* it means *ours*. He is what we shall be. Jesus Christ is thus in the divine idea and intention, He is in our faith, and He is in these because He is in Himself *our* redemption. We were as really spiritually in the redemption wrought by Him as we were physically or naturally in the loins of Adam. We as really died and rose in Him *potentia* as, *actu*, we are to die and rise in Him. All that took place for us in Him is to take place in us in Him, and all that is to take place in us took place for us in Him. So when it is

said that prior to and independently of anything in us we were redeemed in Jesus Christ, that is not a different redemption from what we mean when from a different point of view we say with equal truth that we are only redeemed in Christ as in Him we are actually delivered from the bondage of sin and death into the only liberty and freedom of holiness, righteousness, and eternal life.

It is precisely so with the word δικαιωσύνη, or righteousness. Whether it is our righteousness as first in Christ and not yet in ourselves, or our righteousness as *afterwards* in ourselves in Christ, it is one and the same righteousness; which exists, first, in God, secondly, in God in Christ, and finally, in God in us through Christ. The fact that on God's part it is *given* first objectively in Christ, and then subjectively in us in Christ, that as Christ's righteousness it is imputed before it is imparted as our own to us; the fact that on our part it is first appropriated by us in faith, and so, by consequence only and afterwards, made our own in fact — this does not make it two different righteousnesses, but only one, which is ours in two different ways, *i.e.* first in faith only and then through this faith in fact also.

It is said frequently by St. Paul that we cannot δικαιωθῆναι, be justified, by the law through obedience, but only by Jesus Christ through faith. Now taking "justified" in the extremest sense of not being *made* but *accepted as* righteous in Christ and for what Christ has done, still on what ground is it that we cannot be acceptable and accepted with God through obedience of the law, but only through faith

of Christ? Is it not *this:* That the law cannot make us accepted as righteous simply because it cannot make us righteous? And that Jesus Christ makes us accepted as righteous because He is the power and grace of God to make us righteous! It has been mentioned as a principle, and perhaps the most distinctive principle of the New Testament, that we cannot obey unto righteousness, *i.e.* make ourselves righteous by obedience, but we can believe unto righteousness, *i.e.* be made righteous through faith. What is impossible for us by the doing of obedience is possible for us through the receiving of faith; and what we receive through faith is Jesus Christ as our righteousness, as the power of God unto Salvation, because He is God Himself the power of our Salvation. And it is only as we believe in Jesus Christ without us that we can receive Him within us; it is only as we know Him objectively to be our righteousness that He becomes subjectively our righteousness. In other words, it is Jesus Christ our righteousness in faith, that makes Jesus Christ to become our righteousness in fact.

The double sense of these two words, redemption and righteousness, as the truth expressed in them is viewed as having been objectively realized for our faith in Christ, or as subjectively realized through our faith in us, is confirmed by the fact that every other word describing the work of Christ can be used in the same double way. We are not in the New Testament sense "justified" (δικαιωθέντες) in Christ only, and "sanctified" (ἁγιασθέντες or ἡγιασμένοι) in ourselves only, but we are both justified and sanc-

tified, both objectively in Christ and subjectively in ourselves. Thus in Heb. 10:10, we are told that we were "sanctified once for all by the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ." And in 1 Cor. 1:2, the Church is described as *οἱ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν Χριστῷ*, those who have been objectively and completely in Christ made holy. The fact that in Christ we *were*, and the fact that in Christ we *are to be* made holy are not two contradictory facts, but one and the same fact viewed first in the cause and then in the effect; realized first in the objective truth of the divine word to us, and secondly in the subjective fulfilment of the divine word in us.

The practical working and religious value of this order and sequence in our Salvation, is that the sinner, who on his part only truly and rightly *believes*, sees himself in Christ already in a perfect relation with God and in the possession of a finished Salvation. In Jesus Christ, he is shown at once, his own perfect death under the law, and his own perfect life through the Gospel. Whatever he was under the law, and as judged by the law, he is no longer, because he is dead to the law: in Christ he is crucified, dead, and buried in all wherein he was subject to the law; and there is no longer any condemnation for him, for he lives no longer in that in which he was to be condemned. It is true that this is so with him in faith only and not in fact, but faith is assurance of fact, not only in the sense that it is assured of the fact, but that it assures the fact. And meantime he lives, by the grace of God, not in fact but in faith — not in the consciousness and condemnation of what

he is in himself, but in the assurance and acceptance of what he is in Christ.

And the sinner's present relation to God and enjoyment of a finished Salvation in Christ is independent not only of what he was under the law to which he is dead, but of what he is in the Gospel in which he is alive. How little is he in fact in the Gospel, and how much of being does the Gospel involve! We are not to imagine that Jesus Christ was, did, and suffered all that He did for us in any sense in which He is not to be, do, and suffer it all in us and we in Him. Is our Salvation, then, contingent still, and contingent upon our undergoing all that Christ underwent for us? In fact — *yes*. We shall be saved in Christ only as all that took place in Him shall take place in us. But in faith — *no*. He who is truly in faith and truly in Christ by faith, in his Salvation there is no contingency. He will, indeed, suffer what Christ suffered and do what Christ did and become what Christ is, but he will do and be all because through his faith Christ will do and be all in him. For the putting on of the new man, as for the putting off of the old, he so trusts to God in Christ, that however far off it be in fact it is already accomplished for him in faith, and he comes to God, as God receives him — as one already complete in Christ.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

OF CHRIST AS OUR RESURRECTION.

If sin is our spiritual separation from God, then our spiritual reunion or reconciliation with God is holiness. If obedience to our law or righteousness is our only freedom, then there is no other redemption or enfranchisement for us than righteousness.

As thus reconciliation is unto holiness and redemption is unto righteousness, so, of course, resurrection is unto life. I make use of this threefold aspect of Salvation as holiness, righteousness, and life, not because these are three distinct and separable things, but because one and the same Salvation brings us into union with God, into the fulfilment of the divine law, and into the full realization and satisfaction of our own nature and selves. As beings possessing a nature, a moral nature, a spiritual and moral nature, our *end* must be not only a natural good, or fulfilment and satisfaction of our nature as the condition of our own perfection and blessedness; it must be a moral good, or the fulfilment of an objective law of obligation and duty; and it must also be a spiritual good, or the finding our moral and natural perfection, our duty and our happiness, not in ourselves but in God.

As we have called the being in God holiness, and the obedience to law or fulfilment of duty righteousness, so the best term by which we can designate our natural good or self-realization, completion, and satisfaction is the word *life*. Our Lord came "that we might have life and have it more abundantly." He came, that is, to bring us to the fullest, completest self-realization, being, or life of which we are capable. Aristotle defines man's final end and supreme good to be the ἐνέργεια, the actualization and activity, of himself and of his whole self as man. We are not rational beings, or moral beings, or spiritual beings, or anything else, as we are so potentially but only as we are so actually. It is not the having but the using reason that makes us in the proper sense rational, and so with all our other faculties and capacities. What we are δυνάμει or *potentiâ* is nature or God. What we are ἐνεργείᾳ or *actu* is ourselves. The ἔργον or task of man is to bring himself and his whole self into ἐνέργεια or actuality. Now what we recognize in Jesus Christ is manhood in the completion and perfection of its ἐνέργεια or actualization, the whole spiritual, moral, and natural man realized and revealed. We shall see fully, hereafter, how important it is to conceive and construe aright our Lord's humanity as the true realization and revelation to us of ourselves, of what human holiness, righteousness, and life are. At present we are concerned with the preliminary question of what we mean by life — what life *is*.

Human life is not only an activity or actuality, but a particular or specific activity or actuality, which I do not know that we can better define than with

Aristotle as ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ᾗ ἄνθρωπος, the activity proper to man *as man*. Man's life is to be not something more or less or other than, but to be — *himself*, *i.e. man*. If, *e.g.* it enters into the true and full concept and nature of man to be, as we have seen, not only a natural, not only a natural and moral, but a natural, moral, and spiritual being — a being dwelt in by and dwelling in God and finding only in personal union with God the power to obey his law and to realize himself — then outside of God and this personal union with Him man is less than and therefore not truly or wholly himself.

Now, if life is not merely being but being oneself, and the abundance or fulness of life is being more and more or wholly, oneself, then, of course, all that limits, hinders, prevents, or contradicts this is of the nature of *death*. We know what physical death is, and we know that any imperfection in any organ or any defect in any function of physical life differs only in degree and not in kind from death itself. There is not one of us in whom physical death is not already somewhere at work. How long it will be resisted, how long it will take to conquer and lay low the life that is now so vigorous and victorious, is only a question of time. Not only shall we all die — we are all dying. Our bodies are under the bondage of corruption, and physical death is not a future but a present fact with us.

No less is moral death present with us all. Moral life is the ἐνέργεια of the free will in accordance with its true law of righteousness. Any weakness, defect, or disorder in our moral constitution or func-

tioning is of the nature of moral death. The Scriptures of both Testaments make obedience to the law synonymous with life. "The righteous shall live," because righteousness is life. It is the right constitution and right functioning of the moral man, as moral, which is as much his moral *life*, his moral self-being, and self-activity, or ἐνέργεια, as the right condition and right acting of the physical man is physical life. And, I repeat, who of us is in himself free from those moral limitations, perversions, and contradictions which not only lead to but are in themselves the beginnings, the progress, and the fact of moral death?

But the righteous shall live — "*by faith*." The life of righteousness is inseparable from the life of God in us. The only true righteousness *in* man is a righteousness *of* God. The Gospel is not the law in that it is a righteousness and a life not of us, but of God in us. No righteousness without holiness, no moral life without spiritual life, no obedience without faith. And we are all in physical and moral, because we are all in spiritual, death. "God in us" can only mean God in us in the sense in which alone God *can* be in us. If we mean, as we do here, *us* in the sense of our personal selves, activities, and lives, then we do not mean by God in us the merely natural and necessary being in us according to which He is equally in all things. God can only be in us personally, spiritually, as *we* are also personally and spiritually, *i.e.* consciously, freely, lovingly, actively, in Him. In this sense He is the *life* — the activity, the ἐνέργεια — of our spiritual nature, or of ourselves as

spiritual. We are only ourselves, *as* spiritual, as He is in us; we shall be only wholly our spiritual selves when He is wholly in us. In proportion, therefore, as God is in us and we in Him, we spiritually *live:* in proportion as we are not in Him or He in us, we are, by no mere figure but in very fact, spiritually *dead.*

Now what we see first in the resurrection of Jesus Christ is what really comes last and is but a consequence of what has preceded it. We see in Him certainly the visible fact of a physical resurrection — a fact which ceases to be incredible or even surprising when taken in connection with the full spiritual import that lies behind it. When it is said that Jesus Christ brought life and immortality to light, it means that it is revealed to us in Him that we are to continue to live after death in a risen and glorified life which is not only the continuation, but the completion and perfection of our natural life here. "We believe in the Resurrection of the Body," in which all that is essential to our present purpose is this: that in Christ we are, or are to be, redeemed, raised, and exalted not only spiritually and morally, but physically also — that not only death spiritual and death moral, but no less death physical is abolished and that there shall be not only no more sin but no more sickness.

But if we need thus to vindicate and assert the resurrection of even the body as at least included in the resurrection, it is because we feel that it is not all, nor the first or main thing in it. And in reality the resurrection of Jesus Christ is a spirit-

ual and a moral before and more than it is a physical fact or truth. If He raised humanity physically, it is only because and by consequence of the fact that He had raised it morally and spiritually.

It is throughout the consistent scriptural account of the matter that death is the result and consequence of sin. Certainly it is true for us men that either there would be no evil or evil would be no longer evil, if there were no spiritual or moral evil in the world. Abolish sin and unrighteousness and for us whatever evil remains will be only good or the means of good. For the sinless and righteous one Himself, in the light of His eternal destiny and good as man, the betrayal of Judas and the Cross of Calvary were no evil; and nothing can be evil to any man who is not himself evil. Without stopping now to adequately discuss so deep a question as the evil of merely natural evil apart from spiritual and moral evil, I here only affirm that under the scriptural representation that "through sin death entered into the world," meaning not only that sin *is* spiritual death, but that it *brings* moral and natural, or physical, death — there is at least a very deep truth in fact or *in re*. "There is no evil but the evil *will*," says Kant. In reality, in the nature of things, there *can* be no evil but personal evil; because only personality can determine itself, *i.e.* can be or act, outside of nature, which is God. All evil is, therefore, primarily spiritual and moral — spiritual, which means χωρὶς Θεοῦ; and moral, which means παρὰ νόμον. But spiritual and moral evil in any person will act and react upon the nature or φύσις of the person, and so result in

what we call physical or natural evil. And so sin produces death — meaning, inclusively, even natural or physical death. Not that there would be nothing for us corresponding to death if there were no sin, but death apart from sin would be so little what it is through sin that it might well be said that it would cease to be death. So true is it that the *sting* of death is sin, that it would be no evil apart from the spiritual and moral evil which work their effects in and through it and make it what it is to us. I would repeat that I undertake here no theodicy. I do not attempt to explain or justify the existence of natural evils throughout the whole kingdom of nature. But it is one step towards a valid theodicy that we may begin to see, in the light which Christianity throws upon human life and destiny, that *at least in their application to ourselves*, natural death and all that we designate natural evils, are not evils but only the necessary condition and means of our real life and of our true destiny. Apart from sin what is death for us but "a birth and a becoming"? Speaking in terms of things, and not of revelation in the technical sense, I say that if there were no sin and its consequences in the world, that which we call, that which is now, *death* would be only *birth*. There would still be a change and a becoming, the transition from stage to stage, the ceasing of things that had been and the beginning of things that were to be. The natural man would still need to become the spiritual man, and the earthly the heavenly. But that which had been would be so in harmony with — so naturally the *prius* and preparation of — that which was to be

and which becomes, that it would pass on into it by not only a painless, but a blissful change. This would be birth not death. But because, through sin and transgression and their inherited effects upon our nature, that which has been in us has been "the organizing and consolidating" in our very nature of that which perverts and contradicts and prevents what we were to be — and are to be, if we become ourselves — therefore, in the change the old does not pass naturally and willingly into the new, but strives against and has to be overcome and destroyed by it. Thus whereas it ought to be that the becoming of the new, or the fact of birth, is the real matter of the change, it has come to be that the painful and shameful ceasing of the old is the prominent matter of it. And so what ought to be only birth has become death. *Now*, even in Jesus Christ we can pass from the natural into the spiritual, from the earthly to the heavenly, only through the mortification of an old man, or flesh of sin, whose death is the condition of our resurrection to the higher life. Of that other death which, as out of God in Christ, is but passing to deeper depths of death, I have no occasion here to speak. For us there is no higher life but through death, *i.e.* but by resurrection. As palpably the new body that shall be must be preceded by the dissolution and death of the old, so the new moral man arises into the life of righteousness and acceptance out of a previous death of unrighteousness and condemnation, and the new spiritual man is raised from the death of separation from God, which we call sin, into the life of union with God, which we call holiness.

We may see here the identity for us of resurrection with regeneration. I say *for us*, for it is our fallen condition that causes or necessitates this identity. If we were not fallen we should still be incomplete and deficient in ourselves, and need through faith and obedience to become something more than ourselves; we should still have through faith to *become* holy and through the obedience of faith to *become* righteous. And the consummation of holiness and righteousness would still be that completed oneness with God which we see in Jesus Christ. And still, spiritual and moral exaltation or glorification would, as in Christ, be followed by natural or physical. And so the whole man would pass on and up from the natural into the spiritual, from the first to the second Adam, from man prior to faith, obedience, and life in God, to man as he becomes in and through these. But all this would be pure regeneration, or birth and life from above, without any element in it of resurrection. It would be the life of God in man without the necessity of any death on man's part as the condition of it. Because if there were no sin or transgression, or any consequence of these in man, then all in him, being of God and therefore good, and being, as I have said, the natural *prius* and preparation of what he was to become, all the natural in him, I repeat, would be taken up into the spiritual and it would be *all* birth and *no* death. Change alone is not death, and birth does not necessarily involve death. It only does so when there is a positive opposition between that which has been and that which is to be, and when the becoming of the latter necessitates the un-becoming,

undoing, or destruction of the former. Such is the case with us. Our life in God is no simple, natural, and painless birth out of the natural into the spiritual, out of ourselves *not yet* in God into ourselves *in* God; it is a life out of ourselves in separation from, and at enmity, with God into ourselves at one, in union and unity, with God. It is a life out of ourselves living under the false law of sin, disobedience, and death into ourselves, living in the true law of the spirit of holiness, righteousness, and the life of God. It is a life out of ourselves subject, as to our very bodies, to corruption, dishonor, and weakness to ourselves raised up even in our bodies into incorruption, glory, and power. *Here* there is something to die as well as something to be made alive, an old man to put off as well as a new man to put on. And therefore our regeneration is of necessity a resurrection; it is a life ἐκ νεκρῶν, out of physical because out of moral and spiritual *death*. Life for us is a resurrection for the same reason that for us holiness is no simple sanctification, making, or becoming holy, but a reconciliation or at-one-ment, a bringing back from unholiness into holiness. And again for the same reason that righteousness is for us no more δικαίωσις, but an ἀπολύτρωσις; no mere making and becoming (God's making and our becoming) righteous; but a redemption, a setting free from the bondage and slavery of unrighteousness into the freedom of righteousness.

But to come back to a point from which we have for some time departed. In the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the palpable and visible thing is a physical thing. We say that our Lord was crucified, dead,

and buried, and that on the third day He rose again from the dead. And we are thinking in all this of bodily death and resurrection. We speculate (after the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians) upon the physical change He has undergone, the difference between the natural body in which He died and the spiritual body in which He now lives. Certainly St. Paul abundantly justifies us in all this. He tells us that if Christ be in us He who raised Him ἐκ νεκρῶν will not only raise us, but quicken also our mortal bodies by the operation of His spirit in us, *i.e.* will change these natural, fallen, and dying into spiritual, risen, and living bodies. I have no desire, therefore, to leave out of account the fact and truth of the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ. But assuredly it is only a secondary, or even a tertiary, element in the *whole* truth of the resurrection. Behind the visible physical fact is there not a greater, and greatest, moral and spiritual fact? That conqueror of the visible physical evil, *death*, is only so because He was first conqueror of the invisible spiritual evil, sin! "The last enemy that is destroyed is death." Yes, the last and the least and the weakest! The first, the real, and the really powerful enemy that was destroyed was *sin*. Sin destroyed is death destroyed. He who had broken the bands of the former could not be holden of the latter.

When our Lord said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," so far as that meant that He was the physical resurrection and life of humanity the meaning might be interpreted thus. As He was first in His own body so in the bodies of those who are in Him

He is the conqueror and destroyer of physical death. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Adam himself died and became the death of all in him; Jesus Christ arose and became the resurrection and life of all in Him. But it is manifest that the physical change wrought by our Lord in humanity was but the outward and visible sign and effect of an inward and invisible spiritual change which He had wrought. The resurrection of His body from the dead was but the outward consequence of His having raised humanity in His own person out of spiritual and moral death. In Himself as in us He glorifies humanity physically only as He has first redeemed it morally and sanctified it spiritually.

"If," says St. Paul, "Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness." In this present stage in the process of our Salvation it is with us as, indeed, it was with our Lord Himself prior to His physical death and resurrection. He was still in that body which because of sin was subject to death and needed to die. But although the change from the natural and corruptible to the spiritual and incorruptible body had not yet taken place in Him, another change had been wrought of which that was the necessary consequence and which, therefore, it would assuredly follow. The spirit in Him was life because of righteousness, although the body was still dead because of sin. He had already destroyed the spiritual cause, sin, although not yet the physical consequence, death. Throughout, as we shall see, from beginning to end, our Lord's human life was one long and perfect *sacrifice*

of the flesh to the spirit, of which His cross is the only perfect symbol and instrument; which is the sole principle of all human holiness, righteousness, and divine life, and which in us or in our nature is sanctification, redemption, and already spiritual and moral although not yet physical resurrection.

So St. Peter describes our Lord as *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*, meaning, certainly, not to describe the mere physical fact of his resurrection, but the greater spiritual and moral fact that Jesus Christ was, Himself, that death of humanity in the flesh and resurrection of it in the spirit which constitutes its *προσαγωγή*, or bringing to God.

Most certainly "the cross," in the experience as in the mouth of Jesus Christ, means not merely the material instrument of His physical death. Rather was it that by which His whole life was one great sacrifice to God of a perfect human faith and obedience; the one only full, perfect, and sufficient offering up of a life in which the flesh which is the source and instrument of sin was wholly subdued to the spirit which is the organ of the divine holiness, righteousness, and life. So when our Lord enjoins upon *us* the daily use of His cross as the sole instrument of His life in us, the cross He speaks of is not that upon which His body was crucified, but that of which this was but the symbol, whereby all His life through from beginning to end He had crucified in Himself all sin; and so had made humanity in the spirit alive from the death and free from the bondage of the flesh. When, therefore, to return, St. Paul says that "if Christ be in us, the body is dead because of

sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness," he means that although the natural consequences of sin, as summed up in physical death, are *not yet* abolished in our bodies, yet the cause of death, or sin, is destroyed in our spirits if the spirit of Christ be in us and if we in Christ are walking no longer *κατὰ σάρκα* but *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. And by implication back he means that our Lord's own physical resurrection from death was but the necessary natural consequence of a precedent spiritual and moral cause; that His resurrection was primarily a spiritual and moral and only secondarily and by consequence a physical one.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

OF CHRIST AS OUR PROPITIATION OR EXPIATION.

I DO not know that the word ἱλασμός expresses any material truth outside of that already discussed under the term καταλλαγή; or enough to justify a separate treatment. But it might be thought that the element of satisfaction, expiation, or atonement in its modern sense, has not been done justice to! And although these are not strictly New Testament words and have no exact equivalents there, yet so far as they express New Testament ideas they need to be carefully considered. Ἱλασμός is the nearest equivalent for them. The word as well as the idea is associated in the Scriptures with the sacrificial system of the Jews, and means an appeasing, propitiating, or rendering favorable or gracious. So God has been made favorable or gracious to us by what Christ has done in our behalf.

To say that our Lord by His death and resurrection, performed once for all an act which *satisfied* God for man; which did away with all that lay between or separated, and admitted man unconditionally into the divine favor and grace, so that there is now no sinner so sinful that there is not for him in Christ

immediate and unqualified access to the Father and a full right by free grace to all that Christ is to us from God — I do not know that all this is to say more than we have said, in saying that God in Christ *reconciled* us to Himself. But it emphasizes a side of the truth that is important. *Present Peace*, the feeling that there is *now* nothing between us and God; the possession already of a finished Salvation; the privilege and power of divesting our consciousness of every thought or feeling, but that "my God, Thou art good; my soul, thou art happy"; the immediateness and absoluteness or unqualifiedness of the new relation of oneness established between us and God, by the sole act of Jesus Christ and independent of anything in us, save only our faith or personal acceptance and appropriation of it — how essential a spiritual attitude is this in the Christian life! To disturb it by exacting any condition whatsoever of ourselves, what is it but just so much to limit the freeness and fulness of the divine grace! No; I am disturbed by no sense of guilt for the past, by no consciousness of sin in the present, by no fear of unfaithfulness or failure in the future. Any doubt or apprehension upon any one of these scores is to limit my Salvation and dishonor my Saviour. Since nothing but the limitation of our faith can limit God's grace, it is impossible to believe too much.

It is, in some sort, a coming down from this spiritual altitude to call upon ourselves to render a reason for the faith that is in us, or to analyze its operations and examine into its foundations. Nevertheless, that is now our business, and in the prose-

cution of it we must ask ourselves what constitutes the present and perfect peace of a Christian man. It is certainly not that *real* peace of which I have spoken as being the ultimate end and aim of all religion — which will be perfect only in that future when we ourselves shall be actually and wholly one in spiritual nature, and one in the divine life with God Himself. Essentially our present peace is the presence *in faith* of that which is future *in fact*. Faith is the substance of things *hoped for*. But it is the *substance* of them; through faith "things hoped for *are* now" in the realization and experience of the believer. We shall never get fully into the mind and point of view of the New Testament until we understand the function assigned in it to faith. The correlative of human faith is the divine Word, and the former is only perfect when it is as assured as the latter is true and certain. As surely as in Jesus Christ, who is God's Word *to* us *of* us, we are saved, so surely in our faith, if our faith fully accepts and reflects God's Word, we are saved. As surely as in Jesus Christ, who is the divine grace, so surely in us in Christ our faith sees no sin, no condemnation, no death, for it sees all these abolished in us in Christ. As in God who sees us, so in us who see ourselves, *not* in ourselves *but* in Jesus Christ, our Salvation is not a thing to be accomplished, but a thing accomplished, not future, but present. Thus the perfect assurance through faith of a future peace constitutes for us a present peace. It would be unworthy of ourselves as well as of God, to find peace in any consciousness short of the assurance of a *real* peace, or a real one-

ness in ourselves with God in Christ. The holiness or obedience of another *for* me can give *me* no peace save through the conviction of such a relation between that other and me, that his holiness and righteousness are or are to be *mine*. And such *is* our relation to Jesus Christ that all that He is for us we are so certainly *to be* in fact, that we *are* it in faith. My peace with God, therefore, is not to be satisfied or contented with another's holiness instead of my own, but it is through faith to appropriate and realize another's holiness as my own; it is to see myself in Christ at one with God, because Christ is potentially and shall be actually, shall be in fact and is in faith, my at-one-ment with God, which is my only peace.

"Jesus Christ has *satisfied* God for me." Most certainly He has, but *how?* Because God sees in Christ (as my faith sees in Christ) the actual doing away of all in me that stands in the way of His satisfaction or pleasure. It is a dishonor to God to suppose that He could be satisfied with anything less for, or in, man than the actual doing away of all spiritual, moral, and natural evil in him; with anything less than his actual perfect restoration to holiness, righteousness, and life. To recognize in Jesus Christ the power of God unto all this, and the promise of God of all this, and, therefore, the certainty in ourselves of all this, which is Salvation, is, according to St. Paul, to know the Gospel.

That which satisfies God for us, which opens the way into His favor, in the atoning work of Christ is this, that God sees in Christ the taking away or putting away from us of all that prevented or rendered

impossible His satisfaction or favor towards us. Of ἱλάσκεσθαι, the word which most nearly expresses this idea of propitiation, expiation, or satisfaction, Bishop Westcott (upon Heb. 2:17) says: "The essential conception is that of altering that, in the character of an object, which necessarily excludes the action of the grace of God, so that God, being what He is, cannot (as we speak) look on it with favor. The 'propitiation' acts on that which alienates God, and not on God, whose love is unchanged throughout." If Christ's death "propitiated" God, it is because Christ's death was in itself potentially and in us actually the extinction of that which, in the nature of things, renders it impossible for God to be propitious or favorable towards us.

That anything whatsoever that Jesus Christ was or did was *for us* could only mean that it was to be *in us*. If holiness is my only spiritual Salvation, then I can only be saved by becoming and being holy. No holiness of another for me can save me, except as it is capable of becoming and does become, or at least is to become, my own actual holiness. If righteousness or moral obedience is, in the nature of the thing, my only moral Salvation, no one can save me by being righteous instead of me, but only by becoming *my* righteousness in the sense of making me righteous. Equally another's *death*, instead of my own, cannot save me, but only *my own;* and another's only as it is capable of being made my own, and *is* made my own. As well may we say that Christ's *life* is instead of ours, and not to be really and actually ours, as to say that His *death* is instead of, and not

to be, ours. The Scriptures insist upon the necessity of our actual participation in the death just as much as in the life. The fact is, *for us* death and life are not only correlative, but in a sense identical, *i.e.* only the negative and positive of one and the same process or change. For us, "in Adam," subject to death spiritual, moral, and natural, life is necessarily a resurrection. It is only as the flesh in us dies that the spirit lives; it is only as the old man is crucified that the new man is raised. A resurrection life is a life through death, and a death into life; it is a life which is death, and a death which is life. In it, I repeat, death and life are the negative and positive of the same act or change; there is no death in the flesh, but life in the spirit; and life in the spirit is in itself death in the flesh. Now certainly the *life* of Christ cannot be viewed as a life merely *for* us in the sense of *instead of* our own life, but only *for* us as it is *to be* our own. Our Lord calls Himself "the resurrection and the life," and says that He came that we "might have life and have it more abundantly." St. John declares to us the life manifested in Christ, "in order that we may have κοινωνία, or participation, in it"; and again he says, that God has given us life; that this life is in His Son, Jesus Christ, and that he who has the Son has the life. St. Paul reminds us that we are risen with Christ, who is now our life. But every one of them teaches us that Jesus Christ is our life only as He is our death; that He is our death identically as He is our life; and that His death is *for* us just as, and not otherwise than as, His life is for us.

Perhaps the best way to establish and illustrate this position is by an examination of those passages in the New Testament which seem most to attach a merely substitutionarily or vicariously expiatory, or propitiatory, or atoning value to the death of Christ. See then, first, Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament*, under Θάνατος, the passages adduced to illustrate "Θάνατος, used of the punishment of Christ," viz. Rom. 5 : 10 ; 6 : 3-5 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 26 ; Phil. 3 : 10 ; Col. 1 : 22 ; Heb. 2 : 9, 14. These, I repeat, are the passages adduced to prove that by the *penal* death of our Lord, a death inflicted on Him instead of on us, and because inflicted on Him not to be suffered by us, something has been done, a satisfaction rendered to God's nature, or to God's law, or to the divine administration of the world, an expiation or atonement made for our sins, which enables God to be gracious or favorable, and so makes our Salvation possible.

My purpose is not so much to find error in all this, or to bring out the truth that is in it, as simply to restate quite independently of it what I conceive to be the New Testament way of viewing and expressing the matter. I will take the passages one by one.

In Rom. 5 : 10 the appeal is made to our faith that "if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more (might we feel assured that) having been reconciled we shall be saved in His life." I have shown, and I hope yet more clearly to show, in how *real* a sense the death of our Lord was our reconciliation with God; how in

its not merely physical but spiritual and moral import it was the death *for* us and (potentially, as it shall be actually) *in* us of all that separates us from, and the life for and in us of all that unites us with God; the crucifixion and death of the flesh and the resurrection and life of the spirit; the θανατωθῆναι σαρκὶ καὶ ζωοποιηθῆναι πνεύματι, which is the very *res* of reconciliation and at-one-ment. I have shown, also, how in the very nature of the case it had to be objectively for us in Christ before it could be subjectively in us in Christ. But so only in the sense that — as when I say I have something *for you*, I mean I have something which I am going to make *yours* — the "for us" intends and means the "in us." Now the appeal which St. Paul makes to our faith is this: If God first, *prior to* anything on our part, even faith, gave Christ to become our objective reconciliation, He will not now, *in* our faith, fail us in our task of becoming subjectively reconciled, or sanctified, in Christ. The Christians to whom St. Paul is writing already know Christ; they have been baptized into Him. He argues with them thus: As we have been taken into the *grace* of God, let us now rejoice in hope of His *glory*. We ought as much to trust God in Christ for what He is to become in us as we have accepted Him for what He became for us. If His death and resurrection were objectively and imputatively ours, let us accept them as to be subjectively and impartatively ours. See the whole sixth chapter of Romans as illustrative of this. Jesus Christ *did* by His own act satisfy, or render a satisfaction to, God's nature and God's law, and the governmental

necessities of God's righteous administration of the world. But He did so by then and there, *potentiâ* if not yet *actu*, in Himself though not yet in us, destroying that sin in the flesh or flesh of sin which is the obstacle to God's being in us, and that bondage to the counter or false law of sin which prevents the fulfilment in us of God's law. It is the nature of God as love to communicate Himself, to impart His spirit to those capable of sharing it, and to fulfil His law in those capable of obeying it; and all removal of the obstacles to this is a satisfaction to Himself. Jesus Christ *did*, indeed, expiate our sins, but it was because His death was in a *real* and in no *merely* representative or imputative or substitutionary way, *our* death for sin and our life out of sin.

This will be much clearer yet from the passages which remain. In *Rom.* 6:3–5 St. Paul is answering an objection which might be, probably had been, made to his especial presentation of the Gospel. If we are saved by *grace* alone, *i.e.* by what Christ has done and is objectively for us, may not *we* go on in our sin and be satisfied with *Him* as our Salvation? To which the Apostle, ignoring the possibility of an objective Salvation which *remains* objective, answers as follows: How can we who are (in Christ) dead to sin go on sinning? Are you so ignorant of our real relation to the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ? Do you not know that to be baptized into Jesus Christ is to be baptized into so true a participation in Christ's death, to be buried with Him by baptism into death in so true a sense, that as surely and really as Christ was Himself raised from the dead by the

glory of the Father, *we also* in Christ (if by faith we realize, or make real, our baptism) shall walk in newness of life? "*If we have become united* (by baptism) *with the likeness of His death* (which likeness consists in the fact that in the death of Christ, our former corruption and wickedness has been slain and been buried in Christ's tomb), *i.e.* if it is part and parcel of the very nature of a genuine Christian to be utterly dead to sin, *we shall be united also with the likeness of His resurrection, i.e.* our intimate fellowship with His return to life will show itself in a new life consecrated to God" (Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament*, under σύμφυτος). In the whole passage, St. Paul represents the death as *for us* only in the sense in which the life is, in the sense, *i.e.* that it is to be *in us* and *ours* as a spiritual and moral subjective change from a condition of sin and death into one of holiness and life. What follows is yet stronger if possible. Christ's crucifixion was the crucifixion of our old man and the doing away of the body of sin, the purpose and effect of which was and is that *we* should no longer serve sin. It is true that in Christ objectively the death is emphasized and in us subjectively the life is emphasized, but the Apostle does not neglect to tell us that we can only share the life as we have also and just as really shared the death.

In 1 *Cor.* 11:26 St. Paul tells us that "as often as (in the Eucharist) we eat the bread and drink the cup we do set forth the Lord's death until He come." There is no new light thrown here upon the question before us except what comes to us from the sugges-

tion that as baptism is our admission into, so the Eucharist is our continued participation in the power and fact of Christ's death and resurrection; the means by which they become, or are made, truly *ours*.

The next passage, *Phil.* 3:10, speaks for itself, with need of but little additional comment. In the preceding verse St. Paul describes himself as having renounced everything else in order to win Christ and be found in Him, "not having my own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through faith of Christ, even the righteousness of God by faith." Even if we should admit that the righteousness here spoken of cannot mean a righteousness in ourselves derived from Christ through faith, as distinguished from one acquired by obedience to the law, but that it must mean the righteousness of Christ as the objective ground of our gracious acceptance and favor with God, our justification or being received and treated as righteous for Christ's sake, still the question recurs whether the righteousness of Christ does not avail as such ground of our present acceptance and peace not because it is an equivalent instead of, but because it is a guarantee for, our own personal righteousness in Christ. And the *death*, which the Apostle goes on to speak of in verse 10, is not merely a condition precedent unto, but an inherent and essential element *in* the righteousness itself. "That I may know Him (Christ) and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings being conformed to His death; if I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead." That is to say, his conception of being in Christ and knowing Christ, and

having the righteousness of God in Christ, is that of being in such a real and vital relation to Christ by God's grace through his own faith that Christ's death becomes effectually and actually his own death to sin and all its consequences, and Christ's life his own life to holiness and all its rewards. The death of Christ *is* the life of Christ, and *vice versa*. This is true even of the physical death, in which in Christ the element of *death* is destroyed and that of *birth* restored; so that in Him to die in the natural is but to be born into the spiritual. How much truer is it in the sphere of the spiritual and moral, wherein to die to that wherein we are subject to sin and death is to be alive in that wherein the law of the spirit of life makes us free.

(*Col.* 1:22.) "Yet now hath He reconciled you in the body of His flesh through death to present you holy and without blemish and unreprovable before him, if so be that ye continue in the faith." Here the end and effect of our reconciliation in Christ by His death is that *we* thereby shall be presented, not imputatively merely but actually, holy, etc. His death is to be effectually and really our death to all unholiness, and so our holiness.

(*Heb.* 2:9.) Our Lord is described as having been, "through and on account of His suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that He by the grace of God might taste death for every man." The exaltation of humanity in Christ through death was, before and more than a physical, a spiritual, and moral one. It was the spiritual exaltation, in Him and potentially in every man, of humanity through

the conquest and annihilation of sin and its consequent restoration to oneness with God. It was its moral exaltation through the breaking of all bonds and the establishment of the freedom of a perfect obedience or righteousness. He tasted death *for every man*, because His death was by the grace of God through faith to become that death of every man through which alone he can attain to honor and glory. Further on (5:14), our Lord is said to have "by death brought to naught him that had the power of death, *i.e.* the Devil, and to have liberated those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." His death converts death itself from a bondage into a deliverance, from being death into becoming life. *His* death is life; and so is ours in Him.

I have commented briefly upon these passages as being those adduced in proof or illustration of the expiating or atoning effect of Christ's *death*. Of the similar ones in which the expiatory effect is ascribed to the *blood* of Christ, I will select only one as a type of them all.

In *Heb.* 9:12, *etc.*, our Lord is said to have, "through His own blood, entered in, once for all, into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption." The Holy Place, or Holy of Holies, is not so much a place as it symbolizes a relation. It stands for not merely the immediate presence, but the favor and grace of God — nor merely that, but actual oneness with God and participation in His divine spirit, nature, and life. Into this as man, as the representative and High Priest and forerunner of humanity,

Jesus Christ has entered by His blood. It was not primarily, I have said, a physical, but a spiritual and moral entrance. It was an entrance into spiritual and moral oneness with God, "through the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself." That is to say, Jesus Christ, in our nature, so crucified the *σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας*, so destroyed the separation, as to become our at-one-ment or oneness with God, thus "making peace by His blood." And so the death of Jesus Christ through faith cleanses our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. He is the death of our dead selves and the life of the living God in us.

In the *Oxford Index to the Holy Scriptures*, under "Death of Christ, its object," there are a number of references from which I will select the chief, for brief comment. St. Matt. 20 : 28 has been termed the *locus classicus* upon the subject before us. "Our Lord says of Himself: The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and give his life *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, a ransom for many." The verb *λύειν* means to loose, liberate, or set free; *λύτρον* is an instrument or means by which the *λύειν* is accomplished, and so comes to mean the ransom by which the liberation of a captive is effected. The Scriptures simply mean to declare the death of Jesus Christ to be the price or cost of human redemption, and the instrument or means of its accomplishment. In reality we are redeemed only in the act and fact of our own death to sin. Only he who is dead to the old man is freed from his law of sin and death; or who is dead in the flesh is delivered from the bondage of the flesh (Rom. 6 : 7; 1 Pet. 4 : 1). But we

can die this death to sin only by participation, by grace through faith, in Christ's death to sin. We are saved, not by our ability to die in the flesh and raise ourselves to life in the spirit, but only by the imparted grace and power of Christ's death and resurrection, which, however, when imparted, become our own actual death and resurrection. Thus the death of Christ is the effectual λύτρον or instrument of our redemption, because it effectuates that death in us which is our only freedom from the bondage of sin. "He who is dead is free from sin." So the giving of His life by our Lord was the λύτρον, the cost to Him, the price He paid, the sacrifice by means of which He became the death and the resurrection, the holiness, righteousness, and life *of many*. It is not that we have not to die His death any more than that we have not to live His life, but He has by His own made both death and resurrection possible for us, and will make them actual in us.

CHAPTER NINTH.

OF THE END OR FINAL CAUSE OF THE INCARNATION.

That Christianity is an Incarnation in the fullest possible sense of the term is so indubitably the mind of the New Testament, as of the Church, that the only question before us is to define the meaning of that assertion. In doing so let us remember again the principle that a thing is to be defined by its τέλος or final cause. If we pass by the cosmical and limit ourselves to the human import of the Incarnation, I should define it to be that divine-human process by or in which God realizes Himself in man and man realizes himself in God. In its larger cosmical import it is the process by which God fulfils Himself in the Κόσμος or κτίσις, and fulfils it in Himself. That the destiny of the cosmos is that of man who is its head and in whom and in whose destination it attains its end or final cause, is a distinct scriptural conception. There man in Adam is the natural, and man in Christ is the spiritual κληρονόμος πάντων, heir of creation.

Mr. John Fiske has recently, in a little volume, *The Destiny of Man*, expressed this truth in terms of

science. He shows that man's loss of place in the universe through the discoveries of astronomy has been very far more than compensated by the fuller discoveries of the modern science of evolution. If he had been dethroned from the *material centre* of things, he has been re-enthroned at the *teleological head* of things. If evolution be true it is cosmical; it includes in its sweep and sway the whole movement of the universe. The very order and progress of the sciences embraced in the one science of evolution illustrates how the cosmical movement has been thus far up to man as he is, and how its further progress can only be upon the line of his further evolution or destination. Man as he is, Adam, has been the goal of the natural creation — man as he is to be, Christ, is the goal of the spiritual creation. The spiritual destination, then, of man, which is also the natural destination of the κόσμος — the end and final cause of the whole creation — is the full significance of the Incarnation. I have said that this means not only the fulfilment of all things in God, but the fulfilment of God in all things. And that, not only in the sense that God is the reason and wisdom as well as the energy or power of things, but from the point of view of the spiritual and moral definition of God as *Love*. If God is love, He is such and must realize Himself as such in His relation with all that proceeds from Him. The universe must be not only the effect of His power and the expression of His wisdom, but the perfect manifestation of His love. Love gives, and gives itself; and perfect love gives nothing less than its whole self.

It is involved in the very nature of God as love that He wholly gives Himself to his creation, in doing which He wholly fulfils Himself as well as it. Thus God is by His nature predestined for perfect union with man as head of the creation, as man is by his nature predestined for perfect union with God. The result of this union is of course determined by the natures of the beings united — their heterogeneity as well as their homogeneity. Thus while God can become all that man is, man cannot become all that God is; that is, he cannot become *God*. But he can become all of God that his nature is susceptible of, and at least he can exclude all from himself which would separate him from God, which would hinder or prevent the self-realization of God in him. That is to say, man is capable of, and God realizes Himself in man in, a spiritual, moral, and natural union which is the source and cause of all human holiness, righteousness, and eternal life.

The destination of man in God, through the Incarnation, may be represented, as 1st, his τελείωσις, and 2d, his ἀπολύτρωσις. The first means simply his completion or attainment of his τέλος, without reference to the existence or the removal of any obstacle thereto; *i.e.* without any reference to the fact of sin. The latter expresses and emphasizes the fact of the existence, and the removal, of that obstacle to human completion, which we call the Fall. It is the attaining of his end through the being *set free* from the bondage of all that stands in the way of it, viz. from sin, disobedience, and death. Even if man, I will not say had not, but if he *were not*, fallen, the Incar-

nation would have for him an infinite and necessary significance and reality. We should need God for the completion, even though we did not for the redemption of our being. The predestination of humanity to the attainment of its end through, and only through, personal union with God, such a union with God as is realized only in the Incarnation, is an eternal and essential fact, and not one conditioned upon or necessitated by the Fall. If we take the *supra-lapsarian* view, and hold that what we call the Fall was a necessary incident or moment in the spiritual evolution of humanity, that it was only through evil that it could know good, then, of course, we reduce τελείωσις and ἀπολύτρωσις to one and the same: completion could not be without, and could only be through, redemption. If, however, we hold the *sublapsarian* position, that the Fall was an accident and not a necessity of the spiritual evolution of humanity; that *freedom* necessitated the *possibility*, and so explains or accounts for, but that it did not necessitate the *existence*, of sin and death, then we affirm that τελείωσις would be in the nature of things possible, and might actually have been, without ἀπολύτρωσις. Let us see what in that case it would have been or would be.

The Incarnation, as we know it, is both a generic and a particular fact. Generically it is the Incarnation of God in man, in humanity; and is still in process, not to be completed until Christ is glorified in His mystical body, the Church. Particularly it was completed in the ascension of our Lord Himself, and is the Incarnation of God in the man Christ Jesus.

I have before shown that in the New Testament Jesus Christ means both the one man and humanity in Him, just as Adam means the one man or humanity in *him*. Suppose we call the Incarnation, as already realized *for us* in Christ, the objective Incarnation, and the Incarnation as it is being, or to be, realized *in us* in Christ the subjective Incarnation. Then I say that of these two the second is *the end*, and the first is but the means and instrument of it. God incarnated Himself for us in Christ in order that He might incarnate Himself in us in Christ: all that Christ was for us was but the divine means to what we are to be in Christ. As the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it: "We see not yet *man* . . . but (as the first step and means thereto) we see *Jesus* crowned with glory and honor. . . . For it behooved God, in bringing many sons to glory [*that* is the *end* of the whole divine purpose and process] (first and as the necessary condition and means thereto) to perfect the captain or leader of their Salvation through suffering." The divine end, which God is so often represented as having had in view from eternity, because it is inherent in His very nature, is the realization of Himself, not only as wisdom and power, nor even as mere goodness, but as *Love*, in the exaltation of man as head of the creation into Himself in Jesus Christ. I say not merely as goodness, but as love, because God might have manifested Himself as goodness in a merely immanental relation to the universe of which there was no consciousness in the latter; but He could only manifest Himself as love through a transcendental and personal relation to

beings who could know Him as such and love Him in return. Love is reciprocal affection and action, or can exist only where there is at least a possibility of reciprocity. We may be good to things; we properly love only persons. The love through which God incarnates Himself in, and so exalts us, is not only His love for us, but our love in return for Him. The divine love which transforms and glorifies and, so far as we are capable of it, deifies us, is a love of which we are not only the objects but the subjects.

The first question which here presents itself to us is, *why* the generic or subjective Incarnation in humanity should have necessitated as its precondition and means the objective and particular Incarnation in Christ. Why was it necessary for God to incarnate Himself in Christ in order to incarnate Himself in us? I think that we can at least catch glimpses into the reason or necessity for this. The *spiritual* creation of God is not a physical but (λογίκη) a *log*-ical or rational one. God realizes Himself in us as spiritual beings, and spiritually, not φύσει but λόγῳ, not through our nature but through our reason or our rational and personal self-activity. There is no other reason, ground, cause, or law of things but the Eternal divine personal Λόγος — χωρὶς οὗ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. But the thought or word of God fulfils itself in different ways when it does so in purely physical, and when it does so in spiritual causation and creation. Physical or natural causation is always through the φύσις, or nature of things, and independent of any principle of self-determination or causation in the

things themselves, which, therefore, are simply *caused* and in no sense *causes*, or co-causes, of themselves. Spiritual causation seeks not merely physical but spiritual effects, because it operates upon subjects which are not merely physical but spiritual and personal, *i.e.* which are to a certain extent *causæ sui*, and not merely caused by or through their nature. God cannot be the author of holiness or righteousness in persons in the same way in which He is the author of motion in things or of instincts in animals. Things are caused immediately and without themselves; persons are caused (personally or spiritually) only through themselves, through their own self-causation. God can only cause my holiness *so* as that I also shall be the cause of it. Otherwise it is not holiness, for holiness is a *personal* quality or character, *i.e.* one which is *self-caused.*

That holiness, while it is God in us, is God so in us that it is also ourselves; that not He, but *He through us*, is the source and cause of it is sufficiently evident from the difference in the workings of a physical cause like gravitation, and the spiritual causation we call sanctification. If one worked like the other, spiritual obedience would be as necessary and universal a law as physical. That it does not is because one is God and the other is God and *we.* In spiritual creation, therefore, the thing created is holiness, righteousness, spiritual life. God is as much the author of these in us as He is the author of anything in nature; but He is the author of them *in us*, and He cannot create in us as He creates in nature. The Divine Logos, the thought and Word of

God, which is the principle and cause of all creation physical and spiritual, can fulfil itself in us only as it utters itself to us and quickens and enables us through ourselves, *i.e.* through our own knowledge, will, and obedience; from which, also, we may exclude it. Whatever, therefore, God is to be in us spiritually — our holiness, our righteousness, our life — He must be objectively to us before He can be subjectively in us. He can only enter into us — the *us* not of our φύσις or nature merely, but of our personal ἐνέργεια or conscious and free being and doing — through our reason and understanding, our affections and desires, our spiritual susceptibilities and receptivity; in a word, our faith and obedience. He must, however physically we live and move and have our being *in Him*, stand spiritually outside of us until we through all these receive Him in; and He must be outside before we can, and in order that we may, take Him in, and make Him our life. God can make Himself our holiness, our righteousness, and our life only as we know, accept, and receive Him as such; and unless He objectively reveals and gives Himself, how can we subjectively appropriate Him as such? If I believe in Jesus Christ, the righteous; if I believe in Christ, *my* righteousness; then through faith Christ will be my righteousness, and *I* shall be righteous. Thus what I become in Christ is conditioned, 1st, upon Christ's being that in Himself, and 2d, upon His being presented to my faith as being that for me.

He is the Eternal Logos in that He is the eternal both thought and expression to God of Himself and of His creation both natural and spiritual. He is the

Incarnate Logos in that, in our nature, He is the perfect expression of the divine thought and word *of us* to us. We see in Him what from God we are to believe, and through believing are to be; what we are to be through believing, and to believe in order to be. Now in *what* do we believe in believing in Christ? Why, 1st, in the divine grace, power, and operation which has made humanity what it is in Christ, and 2d, in the operation and power of that same grace in us to make us what Christ is. The essence of faith is to believe all *for ourselves* that we believe *of Christ*, because recognizing *in Him* God's Word and promise *of us*. He is the Personal God become our holiness, our righteousness, our life; our sanctification, redemption, and resurrection: our ἀπολύτρωσις and τελείωσις. All this is involved in the Incarnation, and I repeat that I do not see how God could thus incarnate Himself in us without first incarnating Himself to us — how our subjective realization of Him could have been without His objective revelation to us of Himself.

The more we reflect upon it, the more we shall see that if God was to reveal Himself to us objectively as our holiness, etc., in order to our receiving Him subjectively as such, He could not do so after any merely human fashion, as by word or speech or letter. Jesus Christ was Himself God's perfect Word, God's perfect revelation to us of Himself as our holiness, our righteousness, and our life. He is Himself the Personal God manifesting Himself objectively that He might communicate Himself subjectively to us as our holiness, our righteousness, and our life.

We very properly repudiate the idea that Jesus Christ is a *mere* example or a *mere* objective standard or law to us. But that does not mean that He is not an example and law to us, however much *more* He may be. The spiritual is not the unnatural or contra-natural, but only the higher natural. And God's working in spiritual creation is as natural, *i.e.* as much in accordance with the nature and laws of the spiritual, as all His operations in natural creation are natural, or in accordance with the laws of nature. God *never* acts outside of the nature and laws of things, and so is never unnatural. Now the very and sole principle of all acting upon the spiritual is through example, or objective standards. How can it be otherwise? If one is through his own understanding, will, and free activity, *i.e.* though himself, to be made other than he is, he must be *shown* that other which he is to become. It must be made to him an object and end of obligation, aspiration, imitation. It must appeal to, and move, influence, and transform him through, his reason, his affections, his conscience, his will. Why or how otherwise shall he set himself to become, or how can he be made, what *it* is? The thing which lifts man above all other beings of our experience, which makes him a rational being — attaining his end λόγῳ, and not merely φύσει — is that he is a being capable of conceiving and being wrought upon by *ideals;* he is capable of knowing his ends and determining himself towards them. Now the Incarnate Logos is to him the revelation of the divine idea, predestination, and truth of himself — of *God* in him, it is true, but

no less of *himself* in God. Jesus Christ is the revelation to us of God, but of God *in the flesh*, or *in us;* as He has become Himself in our nature *what* we are to become in Him. Far be it from me to bring Jesus Christ down to one of us! But let us remember that He brought Himself down to become one, and *as* one of us — and if we are unwilling to receive it, and would stand in the way of His self-humiliation with our, "Far be it from Thee, Lord!" He may say to us what He said to St. Peter under a like provocation. I say, then, that Jesus Christ is Himself as man what God would be in all men and would have all men be in Him. He is God's revelation to us of Himself in us and us in Himself. He is God, our holiness, our righteousness, our life. He was (as man) holy with the same holiness, and made holy by the same means, with us. Otherwise He would not have been any example or revelation to us of *what* it is for us to be, or *how* it is that we must be made holy. What we mean by saying that Jesus Christ is not, and does not influence us with only the power of, a *mere* example is this: that He is a *divine* and, therefore, a potential and effectual example, with power, that is, to conform us, through our conforming ourselves, to Him. "As many as believe in Him, to them giveth He power to become sons of God." Indeed we see in Him, as the divine revelation of ourselves, the manifestation *ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ*, in actual operation, of that same divine grace which through our faith in it in Him will produce the same result in ourselves. So St. Paul says that we are raised with Christ through faith in the *ἐνέργεια*, or working of

God, who raised *Him* from the dead. Jesus Christ is not only our example, but through His example He causes and becomes, in us, that of which He is the example. In the case of the man healed at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, St. Peter, in ascribing his healing to the virtue of the risen Saviour, says: "*His* name through faith in His name hath made this man strong." The name in Hebrew usage *is* what it designates or expresses; it means *what the thing is.* So by a true paraphrase we might, applying the words to ourselves, say that, "What Christ is, through our faith in what Christ is, will make us all that Christ is." It is not our faith, but what we have faith in, through our faith in it, that saves us. And what we have faith in is the Word of God to us *of us* in Jesus Christ; that Word of God, through our faith, *i.e.* through our spiritual understanding, affections, will, and self-realization, realizing itself in us.

That same Word of God without which nothing came or continues in being, that is, the Word which as Logos spake into existence the natural creation, as Logos Incarnate or Christ speaks into existence the spiritual creation. But *that* was a φυσίκη, *this* is a λογίκη κτίσις; the Word there spake what it created, and created by its mere speaking; here it speaks *to*, and creates only through the hearing of, that which it creates. "In the Logos was life, and the life was the light of men." *Naturally* the Logos is the life of all things; *spiritually*, *i.e.* of spiritual beings, as men, He is the life only as He is the *light.* He is natural life whether we will or no, whether even we know or not. He is our spiritual life only

as we know and will. He is our *life* only as, through our spiritual reason and free will and personal reception of Him, He is our *light*.

The objective Incarnation, then, the Incarnation *to us* in Christ, was a necessary means to the subjective Incarnation, or the Incarnation *in us* in Christ. God's eternal thought of us could only realize itself in us, spiritually, as it first came as an objective Word to us. It could only creatively fulfil itself, as a spiritual creation, through the spiritual powers and self-activities of those in whom it was to do so. It must enter *ab extra ad intra* through the spiritual intelligence and free receptivity of its subjects, and fulfil itself in them through *their* knowing, willing, and fulfilling it.

If man were not fallen — *i.e.* if he were not in that indubitable actual condition which rightly or wrongly we call fallen — if he were simply incomplete or *not yet* himself, and so in need of τελείωσις only and not of ἀπολύτρωσις, still the objective Incarnation would be necessary for him. He must *know* what he is to become in order to spiritually become it. He cannot believe, he cannot love and desire, he cannot will, and do, and personally conform himself to and become what does not present itself to him as the object of all these capacities, faculties, and activities. Even if, by the definition or in the nature of the thing, it were possible that he should be created *not* through himself, *i.e.* not mediately through his own faith, obedience, etc., but immediately and without himself, into the likeness of Jesus Christ, into the perfect holiness, righteousness, and life

of Christ, that would not be to attain the real end either of God or of man. But we cannot make the supposition without contradicting the very notion of the spiritual, without relegating the spiritual and moral back into mere physical and necessary creation.

When I define Jesus Christ in His objective Incarnation to be the divine thought and word of us and to us, there is intended to be involved in the definition the important truth that God's thought or Word is never like man's, an abstract or impersonal thing. *His* thought or Word, unlike ours, never ceases to be His personal thinking and speaking, *i.e.* Himself. It never becomes detached from Himself, but He is always in it and it is always He. Thus that Jesus Christ is our divine Salvation means, not that He is something from God in us, but that He is God personally in us as our Salvation. God is in us, as we shall see more clearly hereafter, in His personal *Word* as the principle of His objective revelation and self-communication *to* us, and in His personal *Spirit* as the principle of our subjective appropriation, and so of His indwelling *in* us. So that He is not only by His Word all that He is to usward, but by His spirit all that we are to Himward. He is not only *what* we know, will, and become, but our knowing, willing, and becoming Him — and all, not to the destruction but to the heightening, enabling, and fulfilling of *ourselves* in the process.

We might by any one of a number of passages illustrate the order of thought followed in this chapter. Let us take that one (Rom. 7:29, etc.) in which St. Paul most fully unfolds for us the προθεσις

or purpose of God with respect to man. *In the eternal divine foreknowledge God predestined man to become conformed to the image of His Son.* It was the destination of man from the beginning to become what has been revealed to us in the person of the man Christ Jesus, *i.e.* Son of God. There are two truths contained in this: 1st, Jesus Christ was and is what man was eternally destined to be; 2d, man is destined to be what Jesus Christ in His humanity is. 1st, He was God's revelation of us to us; and 2d, He will by His spirit through our faith become the realization in us of that revelation. The Apostle continues: *to the end that He (Christ) should be the first-born among many brethren.* The end or final cause in the matter is the τελειωθῆναι of the many, the bringing *man* to his τέλος or destination. But man can only seek or reach his end by its becoming an end to him. He can only be conformed to the true image of Sonship for which he is predestined by conforming himself to an objective image of that Sonship. He can be created into the true idea of himself only through faith in an objective ideal of himself. *Whom He predestinated them He also called:* Jesus Christ, Himself objectively presented and offered to our faith and to our reception through faith, is our divine invitation or call to our divine predestination or end. He is not only what we are called to be, but our call and our effectual call to be it. And so the Apostle elsewhere (Eph. 1:18) prays that we "may know the hope of His calling, the riches of His inheritance, and the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe" — that is, that we may know to what

a destination we are called in Christ Jesus, and how mightily the objective call will through faith subjectively transform us into that to which we are called. For Jesus Christ is Himself, and will Himself be in us, the holiness, the righteousness, and the life to which He calls us. So, whom God calls He Himself in Christ both *justifies* and *glorifies*.

CHAPTER TENTH.

OF THE HUMAN PERSONALITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

That Jesus Christ is the Incarnation of a Divine Person; that He is not the union of a Divine Person with a human person, *i.e.* with a particular or individual man with whom He united Himself after or in the womb of the Virgin, — in a word, that the Church's doctrine of the Unity and the Deity of the Person of Jesus Christ is not only the doctrine of the New Testament and of Christianity, but is fully recognized and integrally and necessarily involved in the truth of Christ as I am endeavoring to present it, I hope is sufficiently apparent to all. But it is one thing to say that the Divine Logos united Himself with a human person whom He made to manifest Him, and it is another thing to say that He became and manifested Himself as a human person. If He, being a person, in any *real* and *perfect* sense became human, then He became a human person. We say that He was One Person in two natures. But the *nature* of a person is only the mode of his personality, or of his personal being and acting. Our Lord in His divine nature, prior to His Incarnation, subsisted and acted ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, after the mode of the divine being

and activity. He was of one knowledge, power, and majesty with the Father, and, in a word, was a Divine Person. Our Lord in His human nature was and acted as a man, after the human mode of acting and being. He was not omniscient; He was not omnipotent; He thought and knew and willed *as a man*, and *was* a man in all those human activities which, as we shall see, constitute human personality.

In our Lord as He is now, in His exaltation; where the Incarnation in Him is wholly completed; where the divine is wholly communicated, and the human wholly assumed, *i.e.* taken up into and glorified and deified by the divine; in other words, where the two natures, without being changed into each other, are become *One*, we can only describe the personality as a divine-human one.

But we are studying our Lord's humanity now not as it has become one, and the co-equal partner, with His divinity, but, as we may say, in the *process* of its becoming or being made so. He was as truly or really God Incarnate in the Virgin's womb as He is now on the Throne of Heaven; but surely He was not God as fully or wholly incarnate, unless we are prepared to say that His human nature, or that He in His human nature, was as much then as He is now. The Incarnation was not as completed and complete in the fœtus as in the man, or in the man natural as in the man spiritual and glorified. It was the eternal purpose, the end and final cause of the creation, that the Divine Logos should incarnate Himself as man and in man. This, in fact, is an identical proposition: the Logos *is* the end and final

cause, as of all creation, so especially of humanity. He is that conception and purpose of it in the beginning which *it* is to realize and fulfil in the end. The whole natural and spiritual creation is not only δι' αὐτοῦ, but εἰς αὐτόν. He is both efficient and final cause of all, and the efficient because the final: as is the case in all teleological and purposeful activity, it was the Divine Conception of the *end* that caused the *beginning* of the creation: *all* final cause in God is *efficient*, or effects itself.

The Incarnation of the Logos *as* man was the εἰκών, or image, of the Incarnation of the Logos *in* man. If *we* are predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son, it is because *He* became the image of the Sonship, to which, through Him, we are to be conformed, or transformed. To change the word, but hardly at all the figure, our Lord is the τύπος, or pattern, shown us in the Mount. "For see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the Mount." If the material tabernacle and temple needed a heavenly pattern to be built after, assuredly the "tabernacling in us," the true Temple of the Incarnation of the Logos of God in humanity, and in each individual man, needed such an objective, revealed pattern. And Jesus Christ is such a pattern, ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ πράγματος, the very image of the thing. "We all," says the Apostle (2 Cor. 3:18), "with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of Jesus Christ, are transformed into the same image [τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα] from glory to glory." "Εἰκὼν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ: the image of the Son of God into which true Christians are trans-

formed is likeness, not only to the heavenly body (as in 1 Cor. 15 : 49; Phil. 3 : 21), but also to the most holy and blessed state of mind which Christ possesses (Rom. 8 : 29; 2 Cor. 3 : 18)." (Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament* under εἰκών.) But we could not subjectively be changed into the image of the Son of God if there were not the objective image into which we are to be changed. And Jesus Christ is that objective εἰκών or τύπος, image or pattern, after which, through our own faith, love, and obedience, God spiritually creates us.

The point here is that Jesus Christ is the *very image of the thing*, which, through Him, we are to become; the exact heavenly pattern, after which we are to be in Him spiritually created. The truth of His divinity is manifested and proved in the perfection of His humanity. Because He is a man fulfilling the definition and realizing perfectly all that belongs to the conception of manhood; because the whole divine meaning of man, the whole thought and will and purpose of God concerning man, is fulfilled and expressed in Him, *therefore* He is the Incarnation of the Logos. We are not to find the divinity of Christ in anything outside of His humanity, but in the divine perfection of His humanity. I do not say that there was not a divinity and a divine personality apart from, and prior to, the humanity, but *to us* this is revealed *only* in the humanity and in the divine perfection of the humanity; *i.e.* in the perfect human holiness, righteousness, and life of the man, Christ Jesus. If it be said that our Lord possessed divine knowledge and power, I

say that as man He possessed these only as man; *through the Holy Ghost*, and not *as the Eternal Logos*. He knew the mind and worked the works of God through His human, spiritual and moral, oneness with the Father, through His knowledge as man by the Holy Ghost of the mind and will of God. This is only to accept seriously and really the fact that the Logos became man and *was* man. That as man He should have possessed a non-human knowledge and power would have made Him in those respects not man. The Incarnation is not the Logos playing or acting man, or acting through an outward semblance of manhood, but the Logos as man in all the truth and reality of manhood — in a manhood which incarnates Him because it incarnates that eternal divine idea and truth of humanity which He is. "No man hath seen God at any time," *i.e.* God *as God*. There is no divinity visible in Jesus Christ beside or outside of the divinity of His divinely perfect humanity. In *that* He incarnates and reveals and *is* the Logos. It would not heighten but lower the Incarnation to have it otherwise — to have the Logos manifesting Himself partly as man and partly as God by the side of or from behind the man. That might be a Theophany or a Logophany, but assuredly no true and perfect Incarnation. *Everything* in the man Christ Jesus is properly and truly human. His knowledge is a wholly human knowledge; His power a human power; His whole personal life as man a human life. That is not to say that He was not God, but that He *did* become man, and that *as man* He had the faculties and capacities, and exercised the functions and

was subject to the laws not of Godhead, but of manhood. If in Him we see humanity lifted infinitely above itself as it is in us; if we see it with its growing capacities growing into the consciousness of the divine in it, and entering more and more into the possession of divine knowledge and the exercise of divine powers, until in His exaltation the human becomes wholly equal and coterminous with the divine — in all this there is nothing that contradicts the nature or laws of the human. For this it was constituted, and to this it was predestinated from the beginning. But at no stage in the process by which our Lord in His humanity became what He is now, could any law of human growth and becoming have been violated or transcended in Him, for then He would have ceased to be man. If at any point, or in any way, His knowledge or power as man ceased to be after that mode which we call human, and became what we call divine, then, and in that respect, His humanity was *changed* into divinity. But man *as man* is capable of communications of divine knowledge and power, and there is no limit to his capacity for them; and no amount of communication, though it be "without measure," makes him less but more, and more truly, *man*. Whatever of divine there was or is then in the knowledge, power, or any other function of Jesus Christ *as man*, it is the communicated divinity of the Third Person of the Trinity, and not the original or underived divinity of the Second Person. So we see in Jesus Christ the τελείωσις of humanity — that human holiness which is man's oneness with God, that human righteousness

which is man's fulfilment of his law, that perfection of human life which is man's perfect self-realization and satisfaction. There is absolutely *no* difference between Jesus Christ as man and us as men, as we are to be in Him, so far as the manhood is concerned. It is true that He is the Divine Logos realized in humanity, — and we shall be humanity realized in the Logos, — and between the *He* and the *we* there is all the difference between God and man. But the *humanity* is the same in Him and us; there is no difference between *His* human holiness, righteousness, or personal human life in and of God, and *ours*.

It may be thought that even if what is intended in the subject of this chapter be true, it is a needless confusion of traditional and accepted Christian thought and language to speak of a *human personality* in our Lord. It remains to be seen whether it is not necessary to do so in order to clear our current thinking from a more serious confusion. It may relieve us, however, of some difficulty to attend to the following distinction. When the Church insists upon the "One Person in two natures," by one person it means one personal *subject*. The *αὐτός* or *He* in Him was one, and that one, divine; Jesus Christ was not the Logos *in* a man, which would be a union of two persons; but the Logos *as* a man, or as man, one person in two natures. On the other hand the Logos "become man," or as a man, must mean a human person — for that is what *man* means. Certainly it cannot be meant that the Logos assumed only so much of humanity as is impersonal; that He

did not possess a human self-consciousness, free will, and all that constitutes in us our human personality.

If, then, by personality we mean the *subject* of a personal mode of being and acting, our Lord had no human personality; the *αὐτός*, or *He*, was divine and *not* human. But if we mean the *mode of being and acting* of a personal subject, then he had a human personality; because *as man* He was and acted personally in that mode which we call human. In this latter sense He was, as man, a human person; and it is essential to the nature and true meaning and efficacy of Christianity that we should know Him as such. For it is only as we do so that we make His holiness, His righteousness, and His life in any true and real sense *our own*, or see in Him the image and pattern of our own spiritual new creation in Him.

At the risk of repetition, therefore, we must go a little more into detail in this matter. When we speak of our Lord's humanity, we certainly do not mean that He is human only in those parts and functions of human nature which are impersonal. For example, the body and all its involuntary or automatic functions are natural, and not personal. They are not *we* in that proper sense in which what we are and do of ourselves, of our own consciousness, free will, and self-determination, is *we*. There is a great deal in us and in our actions which is wholly *φύσει* and impersonal; which originates not only not from us, but without us; *i.e.* without any agency or instrumentality of that personality which, properly speaking, is alone *we*. Even of sin, in so far as it is natural and not personal, of our nature and not of ourselves,

St. Paul says, "It is not I that do it." On the other hand, the spiritual man, the moral man, and, so far as the natural is the result of these, the natural man in us, are *personal*. They are what *we* are in the use of our reason and our will; *i.e.* of our*selves*. In many ways even a personal being may be impersonally determined by nature, by circumstance, or by God. But to be spiritual or moral we must be personally, and not impersonally, determined; it is something which we must *ourselves* be, if not wholly *of*, yet not at all *without* ourselves.

Now do we ascribe to our Lord only a physical or natural or also a personal humanity? Of course, *both;* and it is the latter which I wish to construe and describe. The personal manhood of Jesus Christ may be considered 1st, as spiritual; 2d, as ethical or moral; and 3d, as natural in so far as the spiritual and moral affect the natural.

If the spiritual manhood of Jesus Christ was a real spiritual manhood, then, like ours, it was of divine grace through a real human faith. The essence of the spiritual in man is the knowledge of God — that *real* knowledge which is not the image merely of the thing in the mind, but the very truth and presence of the thing in ourselves. Now our Lord's knowledge of the Father, was it a *human* knowledge? In fact, His knowledge altogether, was it divine or human? If He was a man; if the Incarnation is to be taken in earnest; if humanity includes not merely bodily or physical but intellectual, moral, and spiritual manhood; then assuredly the knowledge, the free will and personal activity, the faith

and religious life of Jesus Christ must have been as human as His flesh and bones and blood were. And it is a matter of a thousandfold more consequence to us that our Lord's personal faith, obedience, and life should have been just what ours are than that His natural and impersonal flesh and blood should have been. He came to be in Himself first, that He might become in us secondarily and derivatively, our holiness, righteousness, and life; and He is *ours*, either for or in us, only as He is human. Jesus was God, but for us He became man, and to us He manifested Himself as man only and wholly. In the very truth and perfection of His manhood only is His Godhead made visible to us. If He was man, then He not only ate and drank, and walked and talked, but He knew and thought, and felt and willed, and believed and prayed, and needed and received grace, and grew in knowledge of the Father and in consciousness of Himself, and realized His divine Sonship, and incarnated spiritually and morally as well as physically the Eternal Logos — *all as man*, and just as all men are called to do the same in Him. The fact is, the whole truth of Jesus Christ is just as much *man* realizing and fulfilling himself in God as *God* realizing and revealing Himself in man. If in any one thing the man Christ Jesus knew *as God*, knew *because* He was God, knew after the μορφή or mode of the divine and not human knowledge — in that thing His humanity was violated, ceased to be humanity, and became or was changed into divinity. A human mind can only know in accordance with the conditions and laws of the human mind and of

human knowledge. When it knows outside of these, it is not a human mind. Not that it cannot know God and divine things; on the contrary, it is its highest nature, as spiritual, to know them. It was made to know God, and there is no natural limit to its capacity for divine knowledge short of God Himself; *i.e.* short of the infinite. There is nothing that contradicts the nature and law of the human mind in our belief that our Lord's human mind now shares the omniscience of His divinity. But even all His present divine knowledge must, as man, have been received by Him humanly. His human knowledge of the Father, His human knowledge of Himself as the Son, and as the Incarnation of the Logos, in no wise differed in kind from *our* knowledge in Him of the Father, and of ourselves as sons, and as incarnating the eternal thought and word of God. As *God*, as the divine Sonship incarnating itself in Him and in us, He is, of course, as far above us as God is above man; but as *man*, as human sonship, through faith and prayer and obedience, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, realizing the divine in itself and itself in the divine, there is no difference in kind between Him and us.

It is hard to define that faith through which we *know* God, just as through our natural organs we know nature. It is true that all men know nature and all do not know God; from which it might seem natural to infer that we have not as truly an organon of spiritual as of natural knowledge. But the very fact that natural knowledge is natural, and therefore as such necessary, and that spiritual knowledge is spirit-

ual, and therefore personal or waiting and depending upon ourselves, entirely accounts for that difference. All men know more or less of natural things because all men are, independently of themselves, natural: they are in a relation with things which is prior to and independent of themselves, which they do not make and which exists to a large extent without themselves or their personal agency. But all men do not know spiritual things, because all are not spiritual. And they are not all spiritual because only those are so who of God and of themselves *become* so; because the knowledge of spiritual things depends upon a relation to them which cannot originate or continue without themselves, and which consequently often does not originate or continue at all. This *rapport* or relation we call *faith*, and faith is the condition and human principle of the spiritual, *i.e.* of all divine knowledge and life in us. Now Jesus Christ is, first of all, the realization in Himself and the revelation to us of *faith;* of the perfect human relation of humanity to God; of that spiritual manhood which is the result of the perfect union and oneness of man with God; of that sonship which is born of *knowing* the Father. He is *God* wholly in man by grace or the divine self-communication, because *man* wholly receptive of God through faith or human spiritual susceptibility. Thus Jesus Christ is "the author and finisher of our faith." He is the perfecter in Himself, as He will be in us, of that principle in humanity and in human life through which God makes Himself one with us and us one with Him.

Between that knowledge which the man Christ Jesus had, or did not have, in the womb of His mother or as an infant at her breast, and that omniscient divine knowledge which as man He now possesses, there was an infinite process and progress of growth in knowledge which, we may feel very sure, violated in no degree or respect the nature and laws of the human mind. Otherwise, there would have been, as I have said, a breach and infraction of the humanity of our Lord, and so of the Incarnation. I may or may not, within the limits of this present work, be able to touch upon the possible theories as to *how* the Divine Logos could contract Himself to the beginning and growth of an actual human knowledge. But if He became man He certainly did so; and if He did not, then not only is the Incarnation emptied of all meaning, purpose, and value for us, but it ceases to be an Incarnation.

My object has been thus, first, to vindicate the very humanity and humanness of our Lord's *personal holiness*, as the objective realization and revelation to us of spiritual manhood; of what man is constituted and destinated to become through personal union with God by faith; of that Sonship which is wrought in us through knowledge of the Father.

If, secondly, our Lord's faith or personal *spiritual* knowledge and life was a human one, so no less was His obedience or personal *moral* life or righteousness. He is as truly the embodiment of ethical as of spiritual manhood. If the obedience of Jesus Christ was a *real* human obedience, then it must have involved that which is the very first element and condition of such

an obedience; viz. the possession on His part of what is called *formal freedom; i.e.* not a *necessity of obeying*, but a *possibility of obeying or not obeying*. To say that our Lord's was a human obedience and righteousness is to say that He had this possibility and the consciousness of it, and a free choice between obeying or disobeying. This is necessary to the conception of obedience; and if our Lord was incapable of it because He was God, then as God He was incapable of being man and rendering a human obedience. I know that in that *real* freedom which is the end and perfection of freedom; which consists or, for us, is to consist in freedom even from the possibility of disobedience, we have, or shall have, an obedience in the truest and highest sense, and yet one in which there is no possibility of non-obedience. But even *that* is only obedience because it began as formal freedom and has emerged out of it; because, so to speak, it has *obeyed away* the possibility of disobedience, just as we may *disobey away* our power of obedience. Obedience continued and confirmed becomes an impossibility of disobedience; and the very *essence* of a perfected obedience is the loss of formal in real freedom.

So if our Lord's personal obedience and righteousness was a human one, then we must ascribe to Him the human *possibilitas peccandi*. We are confronted here with a question which must make us pause and define our position in a very vital respect. This person with whom we are dealing is the Eternal Logos, who is God; to ascribe to whom the possibility of sin is a metaphysical absurdity as well as moral blasphemy. But then, on the other hand, He is the

Logos *Incarnate*, become *man* for the very purpose of realizing and revealing the true idea of manhood; *i.e.* of realizing in humanity its true spiritual, moral, and natural actuality or fulfilment of its law, from which the notion of *freedom* is *inseparable*. We may add to the first point that it is not only inconceivable and impossible that the Divine Person incarnate in our Lord should sin, but it is equally so that the eternal design of God in the Incarnation should thereby have miscarried. We cannot imagine the possibility of God's having failed in the revelation and communication made to us in the person and personal human life of Jesus Christ. The gist of that revelation was our Lord's human personal conquest and destruction of sin, disobedience, and death, by His own human personal holiness, righteousness, and life; and to admit the possibility of His having sinned, supposing it otherwise possible, would be to admit the possibility of the revelation having failed.

What position, then, shall we take in the matter? If to admit the *possibilitas* contradicts the divinity, and to deny the *possibilitas* contradicts the humanity, shall we make our choice of one and let the other go? We cannot do this; *in terms*, at least, we are compelled in Christianity to hold both, although in fact there are very few of us who do not practically surrender one or the other; and in Orthodox Christianity it is the humanity that suffers. For my own part I hold that the following position is the only true one. If we are construing the Incarnation from the side of the divine; if we are speaking of our Lord in terms of the Logos, and of His human life work as a reve-

lation from God, we exclude necessarily from our minds any idea of the possibility of spiritual or moral miscarriage, *i.e.* of sin. But if we are studying the Incarnation from the side of the human; if we are speaking of our Lord in terms of a man and viewing His life and work as a revelation to us of humanity as it has existed from eternity in the mind and purpose of God, and has manifested itself in time in the person of Jesus Christ; if we think of Him as humanity realizing itself in God by faith as God realized Himself in it by grace, then we ascribe to Him without qualification that formal freedom, that power of obedience or disobedience, which is inseparable in our minds, and in fact, from the notion of man or of human obedience.

If it be said that a metaphysical impossibility on the divine side and practical possibility on the human side cannot be reconciled, I freely admit that I am unable to reconcile them. But can we study the natural or spiritual universe in any direction without, if we go far or deep enough, being ultimately brought face to face with antinomies? We have already expressed one when we say that Jesus Christ is both God and man. We hold it already implicitly, and we do not hold it one whit more after we have unfolded and acknowledged it explicitly. But we need not disturb ourselves *here;* the very existence at all of both the divine and the human, of the infinite and the finite, if thought out thoroughly, would involve *for us* insoluble contradictions and impossibilities. The matter of practical importance to us is to know how to act in the presence of such a diffi-

culty. And the true principle upon which to act is this: In such a question as, for example, that between the divine foreknowledge and sovereignty and our own human free will, not to hold either at the expense or sacrifice of the other, but fearlessly and unqualifiedly to hold both. So I say I hold without qualification the formal freedom and the veritable humanity of the personal human obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ. When He Himself says, "Father, not my will, but Thine be done!" I accept the fact that He was conscious in Himself of two wills, of the necessity of choice between them, and of the possibility of obedience to either. When He Himself accounts for the inability of men to believe, on the ground of their seeking honor one of another, instead of the honor which comes from God only; and attributes His own faith, spiritual knowledge, and right judgment to the fact of His seeking not His own will but the will of the Father who had sent Him, I take Him at His word and draw two inferences from His own language. First, I infer that our Lord would not so have spoken here and elsewhere of seeking or doing not His own but God's will, if He had not felt that to obey His own and not God's will was a possibility, and under many circumstances a natural temptation to Him. And secondly, I infer that the perfection of our Lord's faith, obedience, and life in God was not a necessary consequence of the fact of His being God only, but had a free human ground and reason for it, which He Himself loves best to state in the words: "*because I seek not mine own.*" It is *our own* which ob-

scures and prevents all human faith, knowledge, love, obedience, and life in God, and because *His own* had no place, therefore the Prince of this world found nothing of his own, in Him.

Our Lord's obedience, then, His righteousness, His fulfilment unto death of the one only true divine and human law of love, which comprehends and includes all virtue, morality, or duty, however it may differ in degree, is identical in kind with *all* human obedience or righteousness. It behooved God as the means to our perfection in righteousness, first to perfect the great captain, example and author of our righteousness, by those παθήματα, or human experiences, temptations, and sufferings, which are the conditions and natural instruments of all human perfection. He learned obedience by the things which He suffered, that we might learn in Him and be enabled by Him to learn obedience by the things we suffer. Thus we vindicate not merely the reality of our Lord's physical manhood, but equally and as of more importance the humanness of His spiritual and moral manhood. He was holy through a human faith and righteous through a human obedience; and so was God's revelation to us of what and how spiritual and moral manhood are and come to be.

So we may go on to show that what our Lord becomes in Himself as, we may say, the physical, necessary, or natural consequence of His human faith and obedience; that is to say, the self-realization or natural perfection which was the result of His spiritual and moral perfection, was human also. His own natural exaltation is everywhere described

as the human natural effect of human spiritual and moral causes. He humbled Himself, He sought not His own, He was obedient unto death, *therefore* He was highly exalted. There is a natural exaltation springing out of spiritual and moral dispositions and acts which is none the less a natural effect because it is a divine reward. He that humbleth himself shall be exalted; he that loseth his life shall find it: these are expressions of a natural as well as a spiritual law of necessary cause and effect. Our Lord is none the less human, but more so that He is exalted. And if we are of the same spirit with Him, we shall share His natural exaltation also, even to participation in the likeness of His glorified and spiritual body.

This is what I mean by claiming for Jesus Christ a human personality. He was not human in the merely impersonal parts, functions, and acts only of human nature. His whole *personal* life as man in all its spiritual, moral, and natural dispositions, character, and actions was equally essentially human. He was so man that as such He exercised no immediately or directly divine powers or activities. If He had divine knowledge, if He exercised divine power, it was not *as* the Second, but *by* the Third Person of the Trinity. It was through the perfection of His faith, obedience, and life, through His spiritual and moral oneness as man with God, that He thought and knew and willed and acted with divine wisdom, knowledge, and power. If He knew Himself to be the Incarnate Divine Logos, it was not the direct divine self-consciousness of the Logos, but the human consciousness of the man so incarnating as to be made conscious of *being* the Logos.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

OF THE DIVINE SONSHIP OF OUR LORD.

THERE are two terms generally conceded to be applied in the New Testament to the pre-incarnate personality of Our Lord. These are Λόγος and Υἱός, Word and Son. There is a question with regard to both of them, whether they designate relations within the Godhead itself or relations of the Godhead to the kosmos, and especially to humanity. We believe that both terms express both relations. The Logos is the eternal expression of the eternal thought of God; and since it expresses the *whole* thought, it must be God's thought of Himself as well as His thought of all things. The Logos is thus God's eternal thought of Himself, of the world, and of man. The Logos is also Son, and so *the Son* may mean the eternal personal Word as the Son of God, or the whole creation as Son of God, or humanity as Son of God. But since it is only in the Sonship of man as its head that the creation becomes properly Son of God, and since it is only through the incarnation in it of the eternal personal Son that humanity becomes Son of God, these three are all one and the same Sonship.

We, however, have mainly to do, and I hold that the New Testament mainly deals, with the Logos as God's eternal thought and expression to Himself *of us*. And we have mainly to do with the Son as He embodies to us the conception of *our own* eternally predestinated divine Sonship.

I hold then that the term Son as applied in the New Testament to Jesus Christ has reference to that Sonship of humanity which objectively it has attained and subjectively it is to attain in Jesus Christ. But it means this, 1st, as the Eternal Logos, or thought, purpose, and predestination, of this in the divine mind; 2d, as this realized in time in the man Christ Jesus; and 3d, as this to be realized in the future in humanity in Christ Jesus.

Neither as pre-incarnate, nor as incarnate, nor as to be in us incarnated, is the Son of God to be viewed as a mere impersonal sonship or abstract idea of sonship. God does not, like us, think or utter abstractions. His thought of Himself is *Himself* thought, and not an impersonal image of Himself. His thought of the creation is Himself thinking the creation, which cannot be thought apart from Himself. And so His eternal thought of us is not an abstract or impersonal image or idea of us lying in His mind and waiting to realize itself in time. It is He as He is to realize or reproduce Himself in us. Just as in Himself, God, as He eternally generates or begets the Logos of Himself, is Father, and as He is the Logos eternally generated He is Son: so in us as He is to generate or reproduce Himself He is Father, and as He is to be reproduced in human sonship He is Son. God is

always and everywhere Himself, and not anywhere, or ever, a mere thought or word or influence or effect detached from Himself and become impersonal. So that, I repeat, Jesus Christ as Son is God, 1st, as eternally *to become*, 2d, objectively *become*, and 3d, subjectively *becoming us;* that is, generating, begetting, or reproducing Himself in us, and so becoming our Father and making us His sons.

The difference between Logos and Son, when applied to Jesus Christ as the predestination in eternity and the realization in time of humanity, is this: Logos views man as predestined to express the divine reason, purpose, and meaning of him, whatever that may be; but it does not express what it is. Υἱός defines it to be such a personal self-reproduction of God in man as constitutes man in a real sense son of God. Thus if it were only said that we were eternally predestinated to incarnate the Divine Logos or intention, it would mean, of course, that we were to incarnate not an impersonal idea, but the personal God realizing in us the idea; but it would still remain unsaid *what* that divine idea or intention *is*. When, however, the revelation is made definite, and we learn that the eternal predestination of humanity in Jesus Christ is εἰς υἱοθεσίαν, unto the relation of sons to God; that we are predestined to be conformed to that image of sonship which is revealed as having been realized to and for us, and as to be realized in us, in Jesus Christ, then I say a content is given to the word, and we understand not only that we are to incarnate a divine intention, but *what* the intention is which we are to incarnate.

We might conceive a universe of *things* only. We might conceive a universe which rises up to and includes *persons*, but where the highest ideal or possibility of personal activity is that of obedience, an ethical or moral activity. Such a world would be to God one of servants only: there would be personal consciousness, free will, and selfhood, but the highest exercise of it could not bring its subjects any nearer to God than an external conformity to the divine will or law. There would be between such subjects and God an eternal and necessary duality.

But God as love can never be content to remain forever apart from a universe of which love is both the final and first cause, which has been created by love for love. It came into existence δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, and it is as much to return into as it came forth from Him. The natural creation is for the spiritual: the world is for Adam, and Adam is for Christ, and Christ is God: and so the kosmos flows back into its source. We are called, then, to sonship: not to a formal conformity to God's law, but to a real relation to God's person, and a reproductive connection with His spiritual nature. That is, the destination of man is attained only by a birth from above which makes him partaker of the divine nature, and so Son of God.

There may be several different and true senses of the term *Son* as used in the New Testament. I am concerned with that sense of it which, whether applied to Jesus Christ or to us in Him, is always the same, and expresses the very gist of the Christian revelation. It is not a physical or metaphysical or natural

sonship. It *is* natural, in the sense that nature includes destinature, and inasmuch as in this sonship man attains the spiritual, moral, and natural end for which his nature predestines him. But it *is not* a natural sonship, in the sense that it does not result from the mere fact of his nature, but is contingent and resultant upon an act of himself: it is not φύσει, but δι' ἡμῶν. Consequently in *this* sense not all men are sons of God, but only those who become so by a personal act of divine grace through a personal act of human faith. The accurate distinction of Aristotle applies not only to the moral, but *a fortiori* to the spiritual man. *Virtue*, according to him, is the most truly natural thing in the world; in fact, he practically defines virtue to be the following of nature. Yet virtue is *not* natural in the sense that a man is virtuous by nature, for he can only *become* virtuous by himself, or by his own self-determination. We are not, he says, virtuous φύσει, but only κατὰ φίσιν; *i.e.* not by the fact of our nature, but only by self-conformity to the law of our nature. Nature does not constitute us virtuous, but constitutes us to ourselves *become* virtuous. And however we may be and are constituted *for* virtue, we are not virtuous until we have become so. For virtue is a personal and not a natural character, — something which nature cannot make us, but only *we* can make ourselves.

So, I say, we could never become sons of God if it were not our nature to become so. And in that sense we may perhaps be truly said to be by nature sons of God. Nor do I deny the truth and the impor-

tance, in its place, of realizing and insisting upon the natural divine sonship of every man. But in the New Testament conception our natural sonship is only a natural destination to sonship; and sonship proper or actual is that personal relation between the personal God and our personal selves which has got to become or take place for every man, and which does not exist for him until it has so taken place. It is not until God has personally been born and lives in us — that is, until He has reproduced Himself in our personal faith, obedience, and life — that we are properly and actually sons of God. This sonship in the totality of its conception has been actualized within our experience only in the human personality of Jesus Christ, who has become thus the personal actual in time of that of which He was in eternity the personal ideal. But such is He, and such is His relation to us and ours to Him, that we say that *humanity* has in Him been constituted, or become, son of God; not only in Him as the eternal ideal or predestination, but in Him as the realized actual or fulfilment of humanity. And so He is the regeneration of humanity, or what it becomes by birth ἄνωθεν, from above, by the personal self-reproduction in it of the eternal Divine Logos. Jesus Christ is thus the second Adam. He is the second or spiritual birth of humanity, as Adam stands for its first or natural birth. He is the birth of God not into the impersonal nature, but into the personal life of man, and therefore necessarily not into humanity as a lump, but into individual men one by one, by grace through faith.

When we say with St. Peter that we are, in Christ

Jesus, partakers of the divine nature, we mean not the physical or metaphysical, but the spiritual nature of God. We mean that God is born or reproduced not in our natural, but in our personal and spiritual being, *i.e.* in our personal holiness, righteousness, and life. Holiness is the divine being in us; righteousness is the divine acting in us; and life is that true self-realization or realized selfhood which is to be attained by us only in the being and acting of God in us.

It will be seen that in the New Testament sense sonship and spirituality are synonymous. True sonship is realized spiritually: it is the form which God and the divine nature assume in us; *i.e.* in which God reproduces Himself in what we through Him become spiritually. The son is one in whom the father repeats or reproduces himself, so that what the father is the son is.

The charge has been brought against Christianity that in its distinction between the natural and the spiritual or the unregenerate and the regenerate man, a difference is set up *in kind*, which is not sustained by the facts of observation and experience. It is claimed by Christianity — the charge is — that there is a gulf between the natural and the spiritual equal to that between any two kingdoms or orders in nature; as *e.g.* the inorganic and the organic, or the vegetable and the animal. Whereas we can see, and there is, *no* such difference in kind between men calling themselves regenerate and spiritual and those who do not. I myself make no such exclusive claim for Christianity, and therefore I am not called upon

to defend it or to notice the charge. But I do hold the distinction between natural and spiritual humanity, between the unregenerate and the regenerate; and I hold that it involves a difference in kind and a separation in fact as wide as heaven and hell. Only we must not look for the κρίσις, or division, too much now or here. Perhaps there is no living human being who is totally and finally ἄθεος, or unspiritual; and there is certainly not one who is wholly and completely ἔνθεος, or spiritual. There may be, for aught we know, many a so-called unconverted and unbaptized unbeliever in whom there is more actual spirituality, *i.e.* more of God and of the divine nature, than in many a baptized and even really converted believer. Christianity does not mean that Christians are different and rigidly divided in kind from non-Christians. It means that there *is* a principle of difference and division in kind, a divine self-impartation or grace which works through our faith and transforms us from what we are into what God is and would become in us. It believes that this principle is at work in many who have no conscious or confessed faith in it, and does not work, or works very little, in many who do professedly believe in it; that God is in many a man who may even in terms deny His existence, that He is wholly and finally withdrawn perhaps from no man, and that He is far too little in those of us who the most fully believe in Him. But Christianity, I repeat, does believe in the principle and fact of regeneration and spirituality, and it believes in making full use of it, and of all the means of it, and helps to it.

Let me use an illustration at which we might well hesitate if we had not such abundant warrant for it in both volumes of Holy Scripture. The spiritual affinity between God and man is there likened to the natural affinity and relation between the sexes. I presume that there is no human being who does not in some way or other, and in some degree or other, feel the workings in him of the principle of sexual affinity. Now the end and final cause, or meaning, of all such natural impulses and feelings is reproductive marriage, along with all the social, moral, and spiritual functions which accompany that relation. And whatever the possible and actual abuses of the sexual relation, no one questions the fact that when it realizes its true conception and fulfils its true end in lawful marriage, it subserves a very high and a very essential purpose in human life. But it is one thing to have the nature and the impulses and the powers necessary for the realization of an end, and it is another thing to truly realize the end which is the final cause or meaning or purpose of all these. Certainly not all sexual affinity and attraction does so; in fact, how little of it realizes its divine meaning and intention!

And so I repeat that I make no such actual and rigid difference as was above alluded to between regenerate and non-regenerate, spiritual and non-spiritual, men. I deny the feelings and workings of a spiritual nature to no man; I believe that the powers that regenerate are more or less at work in every man. But just as I hold that the sexual motions and emotions only come to their true meaning and fulfilment in a real marriage, which unites the sexes as their nature pre-

destines them to be united, so I hold that all spiritual instincts, experiences, and emotions are intended *for an end;* and that they contradict their meaning and fail of their fulfilment if they do not end eventually in that spiritual union with God, for which God and our spiritual natures predestinate us. What that union is is definitely revealed to us in Jesus Christ: as it has been realized to and for our faith in Him, so only in Him through our faith can it be realized in us. Of course, if we are made to become spiritual, there will be natural impulses and movements in us to become so; if we are made for union with God, our hearts, as St. Augustine says, will find no rest until they rest in Him. But thoughts of God, and feelings after God, and all the spiritual dispositions and aspirations of one out of Christ, are as much only the preconditions of that real union with God which Christ is, as the natural affinities and attractions between the sexes are the preconditions of the actual union between them which marriage is. And in both cases the impulses to, and the thoughts and feelings about, are meaningless and unproductive until they lead, or unless they lead, to the thing itself, which is their end and final cause. So I deny to no man any natural spirituality he may possess, but I say that it is meaningless and useless unless it leads him to Christ and to the truth and life expressed and conveyed in Christian ordinances.

There is something more than is expressed above in what might be called our natural spirituality. Those impulses are not merely the reachings of our own spiritual nature after ends which are its natural

destination: they are the prevenient or "preventing" influences of God Himself drawing us to Him; divine attractions which, however little they may actuate, act upon every man. Actual, as distinguished from potential or natural, spirituality is the result of a personal relation between the personal God and our personal selves, and is consummated only in that personal union in which *we* become one with God as well as God with us. But there may be a personal and spiritual ἐνέργεια, or action, of God upon us long before any spiritual recognition or response upon our part. We may be subject to, and we may feel, the motions of God's Spirit long before our own spirits become obedient to them. I will not say *when* the Divine Spirit begins to operate upon and within the spirit of every man. It is true that *we* actually begin to become spiritual only from the point when God's Spirit begins to work *with* ours through the working of *ours* with His; but before that *He* is moving though we be not moved. And so I say that over and above a natural disposition of all men to God, a prevenient grace of God is at work upon all men, which imparts to them, or constitutes for them, a potential spirituality. But if there is any real principle and power and truth of spirituality in man it means, and points to, and is predestined to end in some definite relationship between God and man, in which God realizes Himself in man and man is realized in God. Just as all the sexual impulses terminate in a definite sexual relation of marriage, so all our spiritual movements and impulses terminate in a definite spiritual relation between God and us, failing of

which they are not only useless, but are subject to that abuse which attaches to every principle of human nature when perverted from its use or diverted from its proper end.

That definite *form* which we seek for our spiritual manhood, the exact relationship which is to subsist between God and ourselves, and the precise *what* we are to become through it, is objectively constituted for and revealed to us in the human personality of Jesus Christ. And *what it is* is expressed in the term *son*, or *sonship*. According to St. Paul we were eternally predestinated unto sonship in Jesus Christ; we were made sons by Christ's resurrection; we were taken up into Christ's sonship by our baptism; we shall enter upon the full inheritance of sons in Christ in our own final resurrection. St. John exclaims: Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called, and should be, sons of God, *i.e.* in Jesus Christ. And he goes on to add that we know not yet what, through this relationship to God, we shall be; but that we *do* know that we shall be *like Christ*, or what Christ is, and that *all* that sonship is in Him shall be realized in us.

I assume, then, that Jesus Christ as man realized in His humanity — by which I understand not merely the human impersonal nature which He received from His mother, but the human person that He became and was through His own human experiences and acts — that human sonship of which from eternity He was the divine predestination, of which in His personal Incarnation He was the objective

realization to and for us, and of which in us He is the subjective power and is to be the fulfilment.

I have said that while not questioning, on the contrary fully conceding, the propriety of the application of the term *Son* to the Second Person of the Trinity independently of His relation to the kosmos, or man, I yet hold that it has a propriety when used to express that relation. The Eternal Son at least *includes* in its meaning the sonship of the whole creation in man as its head and heir. And I hold that this is the predominant and distinctive use of the term son in the New Testament. Even the Eternal pre-incarnate Son stands there for the eternal idea and predestination of the sonship of the creation in man and of man in Christ. That, as has been said, does not mean an abstract predestination of an impersonal sonship; it is the personal thought and will and purpose, or Logos, of God as eternally purposing to incarnate Himself in the personal life of man, and so constitute him son of God. Thus in the Epistle to the Hebrews God is said to speak to us now no longer in the prophets, but ἐν υἱῷ — in a Son whom He has appointed *heir of all things*. That is, Jesus Christ is there viewed, as He in whom the whole kosmos, or natural, moral, and spiritual order of things in the universe, is to come to its end and destination as Son of God; as He in whom, as the head and reason and purpose and personality of all things, the Divine Logos is so to realize and fulfil Himself, as that the whole creation is in Him to become Son of God. And everywhere this high destination of the κτίσις is represented as to be attained in man,

and as man in Christ. Adam as the head and end of the *natural creation* inherited the earth. In him and his possession of and dominion over it, it came to its natural end and destination. But the natural end is not the τέλος τέλειον, the final cause for which God creates. The end of the natural is but the starting-point of the spiritual. Already in the Old Testament a further and higher inheritance begins to be spoken of and promised — a promise interpreted in the Epistle to the Hebrews as transcending the natural and the temporal. And the promise is still to *man*. To Abraham and to his seed the promise is made that he shall inherit, or be heir of, the earth. But the promise is not to the natural, but to the spiritual, man; the seed which is to inherit is child of his faith, and not merely of his blood. It is a promise made to, and to be realized through, *faith*, which is the organ and faculty of the spiritual and not of the natural man. The promise of natural inheritance was to Adam; the promise of spiritual inheritance is to Christ. But Adam was not a natural man only, but natural humanity; and Christ is not the spiritual man only, but spiritual humanity. "Not unto angels hath God subjected — or given the inheritance or possession or dominion of — the world that is to come. But one testified, saying: What is man that Thou regardest him, or the son of man that Thou visitest him! Thou madest him a little while lower than the angels, Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands; thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet. Now we see *not* yet all

things put under him, but we see Jesus through and for His suffering of death crowned with glory and honour." And *His* exaltation through death is and means *man's* exaltation. But all this is the *spiritual* creation; it is what man, and the kosmos through him who is its head, is to become by grace through *faith*. But what God gives and what we receive by grace through faith is not something from God; it is God Himself personally reproducing Himself in us, and so constituting and making us His sons.

I have before remarked that however much of truth or of error there is in the modern kosmical philosophy of evolution (upon which I presume not to speak: science is judge in its sphere, and can, or ought to, be judged of no man without), it certainly seems to have made *this* evident: That the end to which all things have worked has been the production of the natural man; and that the end to which all things are working is the production of the spiritual man. Who and what the spiritual man is we may not all agree; but I believe him to be the man in whom God has personally reproduced Himself, and who is therefore God's son; and I believe Jesus Christ to be that man. And I believe Jesus Christ to be the revelation of the true meaning, and the realization of the true destination of every man; and that in Him as the personal incarnation and reproduction of the personal God in our personal selves we and the whole creation shall come into our divine inheritance.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

OF THE HUMAN BIRTH AND SONSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST.

THE human birth of Jesus Christ was not merely a natural but a spiritual and moral event. He was born not merely out of the womb, but of the faith and obedience of His Virgin Mother. Inasmuch as on the human side — as son of Mary, of David, and of Abraham — He was the product of a long process of spiritual, moral, and natural preparation, we might say that He was born out of the spiritual, moral, and natural womb of *humanity*. He was born "*in the fulness of time*," — *i.e.* at the completion of a necessary period of preparation and of hidden coming.

There are two conditions of vegetable birth — the seed and the soil. There are two conditions of animal birth — the sperma and the womb; and these two, prepared and ready for each other and acting together under the proper conditions. Jesus Christ was the product of a divine seed in a human soil, of the sperma of God in the womb of humanity. The soil had to be prepared, the womb to be made ready. The womb in this case was man's natural capacity for God, his receptivity or susceptibility for the ἐνέργεια,

or in-working, of the Divine Logos, his power to conceive and bear the personal truth and personal life of God. That this spiritual capacity on the human side needed long and gradual cultivation and education is only in keeping with what is true of the whole development and evolution of humanity.

The first element in a true spiritual susceptibility for God is a sense of incompleteness, and that impulse to what is necessary for its completion, which every living thing feels. Why does the empty stomach hunger and thirst for what will fill and satisfy it? Why does sex desire sex to complement and complete it? Our Lord uttered the first and deepest of spiritual truths in that first word of His great sermon, "*Blessed are the poor!*" A being is only poor in the non-possession of that which it is capable of possessing. An animal is not poor because it has not what a man is poor for not having. One's possible poverty is measured by his capacity for possible possession. Again, a being who is not inherently and essentially poor must have *in himself* all that he is capable of having. He is incapable, therefore, of any increase from without, and can never be more than he is. The glory and fundamental blessedness of man lie in the depth and extent of his poverty. He is *infinitely* poor, because he has a capacity for infinite riches; and because he is capable of being infinitely enriched and increased from without himself, and so of becoming infinitely more and greater than himself. I say again that man's first and fundamental blessedness is his capacity for being blessed. And he who, though least in himself, has neverthe-

less in himself a capacity for *God*, is at once infinitely poor, and yet in that very fact infinitely rich. In this poverty there is an infinite *desire*, a hungering and thirsting for God, for eternal, divine, and perfect holiness, righteousness, and life. Here is infinite ambition with infinite modesty, infinite humility and infinite assurance, infinite self-renunciation and infinite self-realization. What a thing it is to be able to say at once and with equal sincerity and truth, I am nothing, and yet I am and can do all things, for God is incarnate in me! And what less than this, if we will but understand it aright, is the truth of Jesus Christ for us and in us? It is the peculiar beauty and glory of a real Christianity that it is an infinite selfhood that is infinitely selfless, an infinite righteousness in which is no self-righteousness, an infinite virtue in which there is no place for pride or self-conceit.

The *first* element, then, in a true spiritual susceptibility is the sense of *poverty*. That is inherent in man as man; but in man as fallen man there is a yet deeper sense, the sense of *sin*. That the spiritual preparation under the Old Covenant for the New, by the law for the Gospel, of Adam for Christ, consisted mainly in the bringing out into human consciousness of the universal facts of sin, transgression, and death, is clear enough. *By the law was, and is, the knowledge of sin.* But what we need to understand more clearly is this: that under the divine tutelage and spiritual preparation of the world under the law, the sense of *sin* is so developed as (what it is) a consciousness of personal separation from the

personal God, that there is developed along with it a sense or consciousness of the need of *at-one-ment*, or personal reconciliation, or reunion, or bringing into a real spiritual oneness with God. The sense of *transgression* is so taught as a slavery or bondage to a false law, — *i.e.* a false or perverted mode of personal being and acting, — that there is developed with it a corresponding sense of the need of *redemption* — *i.e.* of being freed with and into the freedom of obedience to that only true law which is righteousness. And moreover, the truth is taught by experience that a merely *formal* obedience is impossible for man; that obedience to God's law is only truly such when it is *informed* by God's spirit; that righteousness without holiness is a body without a soul, and therefore dead; and that therefore we need to be redeemed from dead as well as from wicked works.

Finally, spiritual evil or sin and moral evil or disobedience are so revealed as involving natural evil or death, as contradicting and destructive of all self-realization and life, as to develop in man the consciousness that, outside of God and His law, he is dead in himself, and that only by dying in and to himself can he live again in God.

And so I repeat the *second* element in that human susceptibility in which alone God can incarnate or reproduce Himself is the consciousness that we need Him not only as our holiness, but as our cleansing or sanctification from unholiness or sin; not only as our righteousness, but as our redemption from unrighteousness; not only as our life, but as our resurrection from the dead — in a word, that not only

without God are we poor and infinitely in need of *completion*, but in our actual separation from Him we are sinners, transgressors, and dead, and so infinitely in need of *Salvation*.

The Virgin Mary represents the highest reach, the focusing upward, as it were, of the world's susceptibility for God. She was the truest humility, the truest desire, the truest faith, the truest impotency in herself, the truest preparedness for the ἐνέργεια, or working in her, of the divine omnipotency — the truest readiness and receptivity, therefore, for the coming to her of God as Saviour and Salvation, as completer and completion. Of *her* was born the world's Salvation, because she best represented the world's need of Salvation. Virginity represents the fact of an impotency whose potency must come from without itself. In a spiritual sense it stands for human need of divine impregnation, man's need of God as the author and father of his spiritual life. Through the Virgin as the faith and susceptibility of humanity, the Word is born by the Spirit, and man becomes Son of God.

To go beyond this, and to ascribe to the Virgin Mother or to the humanity or human nature which our Lord received from her, prior to His own sanctifying, redeeming, and resurrecting self-activity in it, that spiritual, moral, and natural quality and character which His own human holiness, obedience, and life originated or produced, and which makes *Him* the author and finisher of human Salvation and completion, contradicts the order of things and assumes a Salvation before it existed. But the Virgin Mother

represents all that humanity could be *in preparation for* its espousal with God, and for the conception in it and birth of it of the Son of God. She represents, 1st, all of humanity's natural affinity for God, and capability of union with and productiveness from Him; and 2d, all that sense of sin, bondage, and death, and need and longing for atonement, redemption, and resurrection which the law in both its mandatory or legal and its promissory or evangelical element was calculated and intended to develop. In both these, moreover, she represents all that prevenient grace of the Holy Ghost which is the divinity *in* us that prepares us for the divinity *without and for* us.

According to Christianity, as the Divine *Word* is the principle of objective revelation and communication from God to man, so the *Holy Ghost* is the principle of subjective reception and appropriation on the part of man from God. Spiritual things are only for spiritual men, the word for us only by the spirit in us. We need a spiritual womb as well as the divine sperma or seed, for the conception and birth in us of the Son of God. Now as in each individual experience, so in the spiritual history of the race there is a prevenient as well as a consequent grace of the Holy Ghost, who prepares us for as well as enables us to receive and appropriate the incarnating Word. His prevenient grace is *parare spiritalem hominem*, to prepare man for God. But this is not in itself to make him holy, but only to elicit and develop in him the sense and need and longing for holiness. It is not to redeem him, but to bring him to the knowledge of his bondage and to the cry for

deliverance. It is not to raise him from the dead, but to give him ears even in his grave for Him who is the resurrection and the life. The whole prevenient and subsequent function of the Holy Ghost is subjective. In itself it reveals nothing and communicates nothing: it only prepares *us* for what shall be or has been revealed and communicated. The revealer and communicator is *the Word*. It is true, our Lord says that the Holy Ghost shall take the things of Him and declare them unto us, but that only means that He will enable us to see and know the things of God as they are revealed and given to us in Himself.

There is a deep principle in all this. No natural affinity on our part for God; no natural divinity that there is in us; no even personal presence and personal influence in us of the Holy Ghost, inasmuch as it is only subjective and so only moves *us towards God*, will suffice for either our redemption or our completion. All this is only the preparation of the bride for the bridegroom. No mere desire of the woman for the man, but only the coming of the man to the woman, will avail for human procreation. And no drawing of man to God, but only the coming of God to man will avail for that divine procreation which is the human conception and birth of the Son of God. We see thus why it is that everywhere, in the conception and birth of our Lord Himself, in the spiritual birth of baptism, in the spiritual life of the Eucharist, it is always *the Word by the Spirit*. The eternal Logos, or Son, became, and becomes, incarnate by the Holy Ghost; that is what constitutes spiritual

as distinguished from natural creation. It is not the immediate and necessary creation of the Word alone, but the creation of the Word mediated through the Spirit, *i.e.* through a subjective influence upon the mind, the will, the desires, and the free choice and activity of the subjects of the creation. The Spirit, and consequently also the Word through the Spirit, working always in and upon free subjects, never operates irresistibly or necessarily; it works through the consent and choice, and so the personal self-working, of its subjects, and its working is always *theirs* also. So our Lord, speaking from His human consciousness and of His human activity, says, "My Father worketh and I work." God's working was His and His was God's. It was God incarnate not only in His impersonal human body, but in His personal human will and obedience. In Him as in us the Logos was incarnate by the Holy Ghost.

In the birth of the Son of God the male element is the Word; "the Word is the seed." The female element, the womb or soil, is the natural capacity or susceptibility of humanity for God, prepared by a long course of divine training and by the prevenient subjective influences of the Holy Ghost. Or, to change the figure, the bridegroom or husband is the Divine Logos; the bride or wife is humanity. John the Baptist, in whom the whole preparatory dispensation was summed up and represented, describes himself as the friend of the bridegroom, whose function it has been to prepare and bring the bride to him. "No man cometh unto me," says our Lord, "except the Father draw him." We can only come to the

objective truth and life, to God as He objectively reveals and gives Himself to us, as God subjectively prepares and enables us to do so. "If the eye were not sunny, it could not see the sun." If God be not in us, He does not exist for us and cannot reveal or communicate Himself to us. If there is no Spirit of God within, there is for us no Word of God without. God in Christ is, *quoad sufficientiam*, for all; He is, *quoad efficientiam*, only for those who by the Holy Ghost *will* see and know and receive Him.

The birth of our Lord of human mother but not of human father expresses the truth already involved in what has gone before, that the Son of God is born passively but not actively of humanity, of the capacities but not the faculties of human nature. He is conceived in its womb, but not begotten from its loins. It is the truth prefigured and illustrated in the Old Testament by the distinction between Isaac and Ishmael, the latter the son born to his parents through their natural powers, the former, in the impotency of those powers, by the power of God in them — the one the child of nature and law, the other of grace and faith.

As Adam stands for the natural birth of humanity, its birth of nature, so in Jesus Christ humanity is born ἄνωθεν, from above, of God; He is its spiritual birth. But it is all-important to observe that the birth of humanity in Christ into its full relationship of Son to God is not viewed in the New Testament as completed in His natural or physical birth of His mother, but only in the spiritual new birth of His death and resurrection. In the "Thou art my son;

this day have I begotten Thee," the day referred to is not that of His physical conception or birth, but that of His resurrection. It was ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, out of and by His resurrection from the dead, that He was constituted and became Son of God (Rom. 1:4). I invite very special attention to the truth involved in this. The incarnation of the eternal Logos and Son was, as I have before insisted, not into the merely impersonal but into the whole personal humanity of our Lord. The true and full expression of the divine idea and sonship is to be found not in His merely natural but in His moral and spiritual manhood. Much as we are interested in the very reality of His human body, we are much more so in that of His human faith and obedience, of His human holiness and righteousness and life in and of God. It is in Him as the *spiritual man*, as incarnating the personal life of God in the personal life of man, and so making humanity Son of God — not a *thing* from His hand merely but a self born of His selfhood and reproducing Him in a spiritual and moral personal life of its own like unto His.

We are not, then, to view the Incarnation as *completed* on the mere physical birth of Jesus. The Incarnation was an entrance into *humanity*, and the humanity of our Lord Himself was not complete, it was not all there, in that which He received of His mother. In the moment of birth the physical humanity itself was there only inchoately, and a moral or spiritual humanity was there, as yet, not at all. It is in the whole Christ, in our Lord in the plenitude and perfection of His spiritual, moral, and

natural manhood, as fully expressing the divine mind and meaning, as fully realizing the divine love, or self-communication and self-reproduction in humanity, that we see the Incarnation. And such an Incarnation must have been a progressive and not an instantaneous one, a process which was complete only in the resurrection and in the spiritual manhood of our Lord as the second Adam. It was not the fact that He was born into humanity merely, but the further fact that in Him humanity was born into God, that made Him, and made man in Him, Son of God.

Assuming, then, that the Incarnation and the human sonship of our Lord was not a merely physical, but a spiritual and moral fact, let us proceed to inquire into the grounds in human nature of its possibility and necessity. This will involve a restatement in part of facts already discussed. We hold against Pantheism that the universe is not the extension of the divine substance, but an expression of the divine thought and will. It is not a mode of His nature, but an act of His personality. This is what is meant by attributing the work of creation to the personal Logos of God. On the side of the *creare* and the *creator* the whole creation, as the product and expression of the divine reason, is rational. On the side of the *creari* or the *creature* we distinguish between the irrational, the rational, and the spiritual creations.

The irrational creation is simply the world of *things*, which obey, without possessing, reason. The rational creation is a world of *persons*, *i.e.* of beings possessing self-conscious intelligence and self-deter-

mining will. It is rational (ἡ λογικὴ κτίσις) because it has not only, in the divine thought or word, a logos or rational principle and law, but its logos or law is a law *to itself*. This is what I believe St. John means when he says that the Divine Logos, which is the life of all things, is the *light* of men. He is the principle and law of the being of all things, but of rational beings He is not only the life but the *conscious* life, *i.e.* the light. The rational creation is *moral* since its law is a law to itself and its obedience is its own. But merely as rational it is incapable of being anything *more* than moral. It may through right reason and right will rightly conceive and rightly fulfil its logos or law. And since the only reason or law of things or of persons in the universe is the personal Divine Logos, we may say that when the reason and will of the creature conceives and obeys its logos it is the Divine Logos who fulfils Himself through the reason and will of the creature. But on the side of the creature all that is taken into account is *its own* right knowing and right willing and fulfilling. Its logos is an ideal and a law to which it *conforms itself*.

The spiritual creation does not exclude, it includes, the rational; but it introduces an element which in a certain sense *reverses* its action. It makes God and the Divine Logos not the object but the subject of our knowledge and obedience. God is not the true whom we are to attain by knowing, or the right or good whom we are to attain by being and doing. It is not we who are to fulfil Him, but He who fulfils us in Himself by fulfilling Himself in us. Our

knowledge and obedience are not *unto* but *from* Him; we know Him only as we are known of Him and do Him only as He first is and does in us. It is only as God is *love* that He is to us either truth or righteousness. We cannot know Him except as He has Himself entered into our knowledge, or do Him except as He is Himself in our will and our work. The noble but merely rational idea that we may by knowledge and virtue attain unto God must be reversed into the truth that God in Christ incarnates Himself in, and becomes, our knowledge and virtue. Our knowledge and virtue are not means to Him, He is the means and cause of them. It is not that we are not to have these, or that they are not to be our own, but they are not from us to Him but from Him in us. It seems to result inevitably from our creature nature that he who exalts himself in even the best and noblest sense, where it is only a self-exaltation, ends by abasing himself. What we might say of the greatest of the Stoics who sought the noblest moral conquests by their own knowledge and virtue, and ended in the most ignoble self-conceit and pride, St. Paul says of the best of the Jews who sought to please and satisfy God by their own righteousness, and ended in a Pharisaical self-righteousness which is of all things the least pleasing and satisfying to God. "I bear them witness," he says, "that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. For being ignorant of the righteousness of God and seeking to establish their own, they have not submitted themselves to God's righteousness." We are not to think lightly or con-

temptuously of the genuine Pharisee. He was to the moral law as known to the Jews what the Stoics were to the same law differently revealed to the Greeks and Romans. He was a zealot for the greatest thing in the world, whether you call it virtue or righteousness. But man was not made to exalt himself, and all, even the noblest, self-exaltation ends eventually in self-abasement. The movement among the angels which ended in pride and constituted their fall may have begun in zeal for what was good in itself, and only became evil because sought in themselves and not in God. The temptation to eat of the tree of knowledge which was the cause of man's fall was desire after a wisdom which was not of God and in which God was not. It was what St. Paul calls refusing to have God in their knowledge and so ceasing to have Him in their affections and wills and lives; in professing themselves to be wise, or seeking to be wise of themselves, becoming fools, exchanging the truth of God for a lie and worshipping and serving the creature instead of the creator; and as a consequence sinking down themselves from the likeness of the incorruptible God into that of corruptible things. All sin, transgression, and death begins in *ἀπιστία* and *ἀπείθεια*, in the separation of the consciousness and the will from God, who alone is knowledge and virtue.

The principle of the spiritual in us is *grace;* its mean or condition is *faith*, by which we mean that affinity, congruity, or susceptibility on our part through which God enters into our minds and wills and becomes our knowledge and righteousness and

life. But I repeat that the spiritual includes and *is* the rational. It is only through my reason, through my rational consciousness and will and self-activity, that God *can* spiritually be or will or act in me. That is to say, a spiritual and moral incarnation, the self-reproduction of God in myself, by which I become son of God, must be through my personal reason and free-will and consent.

We have now what is necessary to construct a definition of that not merely physical but spiritual and moral birth of God into humanity, which constitutes man son of God, and which is the Incarnation. Not merely into the material or physical womb, but into the rational consciousness, into the moral and free will, into the spiritual personality of humanity, the Eternal Logos enters as its Lord and Master, as its divine reason and final cause and law. Into this He enters, and in this He incarnates Himself; but *how?* He enters into and becomes it, only as it receives, conceives, and incarnates Him. The consent of the wife is necessary to the act of the husband. That union of God and man from which incarnation and sonship result is a personal and free one *on both sides.*

Let us apply this to the person of our Lord Himself. If He is the Incarnation, He is it on both its sides — *ex parte Dei* and *ex parte hominis.* He is not only God incarnating Himself in man, but man incarnating God in himself. He is not only the Eternal Personal Logos incarnating Himself in humanity, but humanity personally incarnating the Eternal Logos. He is not only the grace that im-

parts itself, but the faith which receives. What is all this but to say, with all the creeds, that He is both God and man in the Incarnation? To say anything less is to say that He is less man than He is God. We see in Jesus Christ not only a divine person who has become man, but *equally* a human person in whose human holiness, righteousness, and life — *i.e.* in whose spiritual and moral personal or self-activity — God has become man. Not that there are in Him two persons or personal subjects, a divine and a human; but the One Person as divine is a divine person, and as human is a human person, and in the complete spiritual, moral, and natural union and unity in Himself of Himself as divine and of Himself as human has become a divine-human person. On His divine side our Lord is the eternal idea in God as it has expressed itself in man; on His human side He is man who has expressed in Himself the eternal idea of God. But when we are studying Him on His human side as the divine revelation to us, not of what God is in man, but what man is in God, we are not honoring our Lord by limiting His divine condescension of love and trying to make Him more God by making Him less man. The divinest thing in God is His love, and the love of God is best measured by the depth to which He Himself descended in order thence to raise and exalt us.

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

OF THE HUMAN SINLESSNESS OF JESUS CHRIST.

It is, of course, evident from any point of view that the sinlessness of Jesus Christ is the first and most vital postulate of Christianity. It constitutes in a peculiar degree the gist and essence of that theory of Salvation which I have been advocating, because, according to it, our Lord's human sinlessness was *in itself* the atonement, redemption, and resurrection of humanity in which human Salvation consists.

A great deal depends, however, upon a proper understanding of the nature of this sinlessness. In the first place it was essentially a *human* and not a divine sinlessness, the sinlessness of a human and not a divine person. Our Lord was sinless not by mere fact or necessary consequence of being God, but in the freedom of His personal faith and obedience as man. We might say that it was not the necessary sinlessness of His divine self as Second Person of the Trinity, but the voluntary sinlessness of His human self by the Third Person of the Trinity.

Sinlessness, however, is a negative term which very inadequately expresses that in our Lord which we designate by it. An absolute negative sinlessness is

possible only through the possession of a positive perfect holiness and righteousness. Now human holiness is a very definite and definable thing. It is the divine nature or character in a human person; it is what a man is through faith in God, or what God is in a man by grace through faith. When it has attained its true norm or type and perfect image, it is the reproduction of the personal God in the personal man, by which man becomes partaker of the divine nature, and is made son of God. The human principle of holiness is faith, which we may also here define anew. The possibility of faith lies in a natural affinity or susceptibility for God which predestinates and predisposes us to that knowledge of and union with Him which we see completed and manifested in the perfect human sonship of Jesus Christ. To say that man is *spiritual* is simply to say of him with respect to God and the life of God what we say of him with respect to nature and the life of nature when we say that he is *natural*. As natural, or through his natural side, he is related to and one with nature, lives the life of nature, and is what nature is in him or makes him. As spiritual, or through his spiritual side, he is related to and made to be one with God, receives and lives the life of God, and becomes what God is in him and makes him. The difference being that nature makes him impersonally or necessarily, *i.e.* without himself or his own conscious and free co-operation in the matter; while God makes him personally and voluntarily, through the conscious and free receptivity of his own faith and co-operation. That faith should not

remain a mere blind spiritual instinct or impulse (which is contrary to its nature), but attain its rational, free, and conscious *end*, there must be an objective revelation and communication to it of that end. There must be not only the pre- and post-venient action of the Divine Spirit *in* us, but the communication of the Divine Word *to* us. Faith for the full realization of itself requires not only the subjective impulse πρός τι, but the objective goal πρὸς ὅ. The condition and *sine qua non* of its perfect activity is the objective λόγος and the subjective πνεῦμα, "the Word by the Spirit."

Now if the holiness of Jesus Christ was a *human* holiness, it was a holiness *of faith*. And if the faith of Jesus Christ was a *human* faith, then subjectively it was of the Holy Ghost, and objectively it was of the Logos or Divine Word.

When we say, as I do, that the Divine Logos incarnated Himself in Jesus Christ not merely physically, but spiritually and morally; not merely in His material or physical flesh, nor merely in His impersonal nature as man, but through and in His personal human faith and obedience, we raise several questions. The Logos, who is the object of *our* faith and obedience and subjective incarnation, is objectively incarnated and presented to our faith, etc., in our Lord's human person. But how was He presented *to Him*, *i.e.* to *Himself* as man, for His personal incarnation through faith? How could He as man incarnate Himself as the Divine Word? Before endeavoring to answer these questions, let us expand the position to be explained a little more. I

affirm that Jesus Christ freely and humanly — through His personal human faith and obedience, through and in His personal human holiness and righteousness — personally realized in His humanity the eternal divine idea and predestination of human sonship, and *so* (I will not say was the *Divine* λόγος and υἱός, for He was these before and independently of what He was or did in His humanity, but *so*) was or became the Divine Word and Son *incarnate*, or *as man*. This He could only do by the Holy Ghost within Him and the Logos without Him. *That is*, if it was through His human knowledge and free will, through His personal holiness and righteousness, that He as man incarnated the Logos, then in some way the Logos was objective to His consciousness and will before He was incarnated in them.

Ab initio, from the moment of His human conception, prior to any human consciousness and will, *physically* Jesus Christ was the Incarnate Word. But He was not so and could not be so *spiritually and morally* prior to human consciousness and will. He was only so *spiritually* through His human faith and *morally* through His human obedience; and the Logos could incarnate Himself in Him spiritually only through His faith in Him and morally only through His obedience to Him. Otherwise it is not an incarnation, but a logophany, — the Logos not as man in reality, but as man only in semblance.

The above position is of sufficient delicacy, difficulty, and importance to justify a somewhat extended attempt at explanation and justification.

I have taken the ground that not only did the

Logos personally incarnate Himself in the man Christ Jesus, but that the man Christ Jesus personally incarnated the Logos; that it was a free act on both sides, to deny or limit which, on the human side, is to impair if not destroy the humanity, is to make the incarnation on the human side a mechanical, physical, and necessary, and in no sense a spiritual and moral fact. That is, it would take away all *human*, spiritual, and moral activity in the matter, and reduce the Incarnation to a mere logophany. The position here taken raises serious difficulties, but not insuperable ones; and, in fact, it *creates* no difficulties, but only *raises* such as are implicitly involved in *any* real view of the Incarnation. We say that from the moment of conception in the womb of the Virgin the Logos became *man;* but in a sense which is incontrovertible, it would be equally correct to say that from that moment He *began* to become man. For assuredly no one would affirm that He was at that moment the *whole* man He was to be and did eventually become, or that He is now. There was then and until conscious life began only physical and no spiritual or moral manhood in Him. Even *physically* He was not then the man He afterwards became before His death; and still less the man He is since His resurrection and ascension. What He is physically *now* is the result not merely of His having as Logos assumed the physical nature of man, but of what personally as man He was and did in that nature. If He had not sanctified and redeemed it by His personal human holiness and righteousness, He would not have quickened it with His divine life or exalted

it to His divine glory. But if physically even, Jesus Christ was not by the mere conception and birth of the Virgin a completed incarnation, still less so was He spiritually and morally. He became so in these respects only when through His personal faith He had perfectly spiritually, and when through His personal obedience He had perfectly morally incarnated the Logos. It will be said, this means that our Lord then *was not* the Logos from the beginning of His human life, but only progressively *became so* as He, through His human faith and obedience, subjectively realized and fulfilled, *i.e.* incarnated Him. Let us see how true this is, and first let us look at it from the human side.

I am not *I* in all the completeness of my idea and meaning from the moment of my conception or my birth. I may be potentially, but I certainly am not actually so. There is only the germ or beginning of my physical and none whatever of my spiritual or moral selfhood there. Now if in me the *nature* were all, and there was no *personality*, the evolution of the potential into the actual would proceed of itself, and I would become myself without any part in it of my own. But if I am a person I have something to do in the matter, and it cannot proceed without *me*. It is only as *I*, consciously and freely, spiritually and morally, realize and fulfil myself that I can or will ever *become myself*. It is the characteristic of a person that he has first to know himself before he can become himself; and not only know, but will himself and fulfil himself. The idea of himself has to be objectively present to him before in act and fact he

can subjectively realize and become himself. Now when I say that Jesus Christ as man was the Logos incarnate *only* as He Himself as man personally incarnated the Logos, I mean it only in the sense in which I say that I am I, in the totality of the meaning and truth of me, only as *I myself* become I; only as I through knowledge and consciousness of myself, through purposing, willing, and fulfilling of myself, become myself. If the Logos were merely as Logos to become man, without *as man* having anything to do with the becoming — without His human consciousness, will, and choice having any part in it, or independently of His human faith and obedience — why did He undergo such a *semblance* of not merely physical, but spiritual and moral human growth and becoming? Why did He — so humanly that we can see no difference between Him and us, save only in degree — not only increase in stature, but grow in grace and faith, and learn obedience by all the experiences of His natural life? It no more militates against our Lord's having been the Eternal Logos and Son from the beginning of His human life to say that *as man* He only *gradually* knew Himself and willed Himself and realized or became Himself as Logos or Son, than it does against *my* having been myself in the womb to say that I did not then know myself, or that I do not yet know and certainly have not yet realized or fulfilled or become my whole self. One thing is perfectly certain: if the Logos became man at all in any real sense, He became so only as a man *can* become himself, — viz. through and in the growing consciousness, free will, and self-becoming

of the man He became. The reality of the Incarnation does not consist half so much in the reality of our Lord's human flesh, as it does in the reality of His human experiences and life and of that spiritual and moral character which was the result of His human faith and obedience.

If now again it be asked, *how* the Logos incarnate, or as man, *knew* Himself as Logos so as through this knowledge of Himself to realize or become Himself in His humanity, I answer as follows. We are able to say that if the Divine Logos incarnates Himself *at all*, *i.e.* if He appears in a humanity which is such in its totality, in its personal as well as its impersonal elements, in its spiritual and moral as well as in its merely physical aspects and activities — He *must* do so through and in the spiritual knowledge of Him and the moral obedience and conformity to Him of the humanity in which He is incarnate. If, then, we are asked *how* this spiritual consciousness and knowledge are to be accounted for, how the Logos as God is known to Himself as man so that as man He may realize and become Himself as God, or may humanly incarnate Himself as Divine λόγος or υἱός, — all that we can say is that He *has done* so, and [it is not necessary that we should be able to account for how He could do so.] The difference between our Lord as man and us as men is that He is not a man who incarnates the Logos, but the Logos who incarnates Himself as, or becomes, a man. But the man whom He becomes as humanly incarnates Him as He incarnates Himself in Him. We do not make it *less* a self-incarnation of the Logos by mak-

ing it an incarnation of Himself into spiritual and moral as well as into physical humanity, — an incarnation, *i.e.* into the spiritual consciousness and free will and self-activity of the personal human life, as well as into the impersonal human nature into which He entered. The Divine Logos could become *humanly* known to Himself as His human consciousness was more and more capacitated to receive Him, and could humanly manifest Himself as His own human will and personal activity were more and more able to enact and express Him. He could thus incarnate Himself in the incarnating faith and obedience and personally, freely, *becoming-Him* of His humanity, just as truly as He could have done so in the impersonal and non-co-operating physical nature merely of humanity. Only in this last case He would not truly have become *man*, and man would not truly, because not freely and personally, have become, or incarnated, the Logos. It is infinitely interesting to us that God should have become man. It is infinitely more interesting to us that He should have become so, not by a necessary and mechanical assumption of an impersonal human nature, but through the conscious, rational, voluntary, and loving incarnating Him of a personal humanity. For in this last view of the Incarnation we see not only *God* becoming man in the very truest and fullest sense of a real spiritual, moral, and natural manhood, but we see *man*, in an equally true, full, and real sense, freely fulfilling himself by freely incarnating in himself the eternal Word and realizing in himself the eternal divine sonship.

It is very true that we have no sooner, by the above view, asserted for our Lord's humanity a human freedom in His self-incarnation of the Logos, than we proceed to take it away by making the Incarnation so a divine act of the Logos as to leave no place for the freedom of the humanity in incarnating Him. I have before said that just here is the true *locus* of the antinomy inseparable from the union of the divine and the human in one person. Construed from the divine side, I confess I see no place for any human formal freedom (*possibilitas peccandi*) in our Lord. The Logos incarnate in Him was, even as man, still the Divine Logos, and could neither have personally erred nor have miscarried or failed in carrying out the divine work of human redemption and salvation. The whole work of Jesus Christ was as really and as much *an act of God* spiritually creating man as that first act or process was by which man was naturally created. On the other hand, construing our Lord's humanity from the human side, we see in Him just as certainly and truly the act or process by which man by his faith and obedience incarnates God, as from the other side we saw that by which God incarnates Himself in man. And we must affirm the humanity as unequivocally as we do the deity. Our Lord's growth in the consciousness of Himself; the reality of His temptations, and the freedom of His choice, under all circumstances, of His Father's will as against a possible choice of His own will; His use and need of faith and prayer, and His sole dependence upon the Holy Ghost and divine grace; His learning obedience — not

merely proving Himself obedient, but becoming more and more obedient — by the providential experiences, trials, sufferings, and temptations of human life, so divinely adapted to be the opportunities and conditions of human obedience; His human doubts and fears, and sense of weakness, and εὐλάβεια or laying hold upon Him who was alone able to save Him (we must believe spiritually and morally as well as physically), — all these are unworthy semblances and make-believes of a *personal* humanity which He did not really assume unless we take them in earnest and see in Him an actual and real humanity, different from ours only in the fact of its being sinless.

Seeing all this, we are able to see in Him what God purposed that we should — a revelation to us not only of Him but of ourselves; of Him in ourselves, and therefore of ourselves in Him. We can see in Him the type and image of that human divine sonship for which we are predestined, and to which we are to be conformed by the power of the objective Word transforming us through the subjective Spirit into personal likeness to Himself. We can see in Him the way, the truth, and the life for all humanity — man's way, through faith, suffering, and obedience into God in whom alone he comes to the truth of himself through participation in the divine and eternal life of God. I repeat, that for the Divine Word to incarnate Himself thus in the perfection and perfect realization of a *personal* human life makes it not less an *incarnation*, nor less a self-incarnating act of the Logos, than if it had been an incarnation into

only an *impersonal* human nature. And when it is said: "You make our Lord a man humanly incarnating God, or the word and spirit of God, just as any man and every man might and should incarnate Him," my answer is: "Yes, I do. Sin being excepted, what right have we to make *any other* exception to the identity of our Lord's humanity with our own? He is unlike us in the *fact* alone of His sinlessness, not so in the *mode* of it. For He was sinless only in the way in which alone we could become sinless — viz. through faith, obedience, and self-crucifixion — by the spiritual, moral, and real incarnating in Himself of the divine nature, law, and life. *Only* no mere man could so have incarnated God, no one could have been such a man, so incarnating the Divine Word and Spirit, but He in whom the Divine Word and Spirit had so incarnated themselves as to enable him to be and to do so. And, moreover, any man and every man could not *now* similarly incarnate the Divine Word and Spirit if God had not revealed and given to us such an objective incarnation in *Him*. For Jesus Christ is not only the revelation of such an incarnation as we could never without Him have known, or in our wildest presumption have dreamed of or aspired to; but he is the gift and communication to us of an incarnation which only through the knowledge of Him, and personal union and communion with Him, and by the spirit and power of Him, could ever be realized in us. Man cannot incarnate God except as God enables him to do so by incarnating Himself in him. Jesus Christ Himself, *as man*, could only incarnate the Divine Word and Spirit as

He was *these* incarnate. And *we* can neither know, nor have, nor incarnate, God's Word or Spirit save as these have incarnated themselves in humanity in Jesus Christ and incarnate themselves in us as incorporate in the humanity, or members of the body, of Jesus Christ.

That our Lord as man was not the mere necessary incarnation of the Logos, but Himself freely incarnated the Logos, by his own personal human faith and obedience, is, I think, taught by Himself in that one of the Gospels which most clearly reveals His divine, pre-incarnate personality as the Logos. "I do nothing of Myself," says He; "but as My Father taught me I speak these things." And this, not once or twice, but consistently and always. "I speak and act," He says, "only as I see and hear of My Father." And this *seeing and hearing* He interprets to be a wholly human disposition and action, by attributing it to a wholly human condition — viz. to His wholly seeking His Father's and not His own will. Contrasting Himself in this respect with the Pharisees who *could not believe* because they sought and received glory from themselves and not the glory that comes from God alone. "I have spoken, not from Myself, but the Father which sent Me He hath given Me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life eternal. The things, therefore, which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me so I speak." I repeat that there can be no doubt that according to the Gospel of St. John, Jesus Christ is the incarnation of a pre-incarnate Divine Person. Yet

the representation is not that of a merely physical and necessary incarnation — the manifestation of the Logos in an impersonal human nature. On the contrary, as *ex parte Dei* we see the Divine Person incarnating Himself in humanity, so *ex parte hominis* we see no less the human person He became, by a human faith, obedience, and self-surrender, by an eye to see and an ear to hear and a will to receive and to fulfil, freely and humanly incarnating the divine. The Logos, as Logos, would not need to be taught: He would have spoken of Himself. But the Logos as man — if he was man indeed and not in semblance — could know only through the eyes and ears of a human faith, and act only through the obedience of a human will. He must, moreover, *grow* in knowledge, and *begin and finish* the great lesson of faith, and *learn* obedience; and he could be the *completed* incarnation of the Logos only in the final exaltation of His human powers to the full capacity for receiving and the perfect faculty of enacting the Divine Person incarnate in them.

If all this was so positively, then I say with respect to the negative fact of our Lord's sinlessness that it was human and not divine — in *this* sense, that it was not the sinlessness of His divine self as Logos (that was necessary, and would go without saying), but the sinlessness of His human self by the Holy Ghost. It was, positively, the holiness of a human faith, and the righteousness of a human obedience.

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

OF THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS CHRIST. — *Continued.*

THERE is another, even more important, difficult and delicate, question with regard to the nature of our Lord's human sinlessness. And that is, whether and to what extent it was due to the mere fact of His assuming a so-called sinless *nature*, or a nature made sinless for His assumption; or whether, on the other hand, *He Himself* was (of course, by the Holy Ghost) *the author* of His sinlessness in the nature. That is to say, whether, and how much, His sinlessness was fact of His nature, *or* act of Himself. I hold that our Lord's sinlessness was wholly *personal*, and not *natural;* and this, for several reasons which seem to me conclusive. Let us remember that we are not *now* speaking of the *divine*, either nature or personality, but the *human*. Assuming that our Lord's sinlessness is, in the sense above argued, a human one, the question next arises, how much, if at all, it was due to His having a human nature, *not*, like ours, fallen and enfeebled and enslaved by sin, *but* unfallen and unimpaired by sin; or, how much it was due, not to any advantage of His *nature* as man, but to His own *personal* human action and life in

the nature, so that He Himself, and not any previously prepared sinlessness of His nature, was the ground and cause of His sinlessness in it. It will be observed that in either case our Lord's sinlessness as man is held as essential, and the only question is how much it is to be ascribed to His nature and how much to Himself.

There are several sufficient reasons for holding that the sinlessness or holiness of Jesus Christ, while extending, of course, through His whole spiritual, moral, and natural humanity, was yet, as regards its source or origin in Him, wholly personal or of Himself, and not natural or through His nature.

In the first place, from the nature of the thing itself. Properly speaking, there is, or can be, no such thing as a sinful or sinless *nature*. Sinfulness or sinlessness is a *personal* and not a *natural* quality. It may be true enough to say that men, and all men, are sinful by nature, but it is *they* who are sinful, and not the nature. Our nature may be such or in such condition that we cannot be sinless in it, and so may be viewed as the source of sin in us, and itself sinful; but in reality the sin and the sinfulness is in us as persons, and all that there is in the nature is an *ἀσθένεια*, which manifests itself as a *natural inability* in us for sinlessness; *i.e.* for holiness, righteousness, and life. This weakness of the nature may be such that only by a redemption or salvation from it can we be restored to the power of holiness, etc., but a mere natural condition prior to all personal consciousness, will, or self-determination, is not in itself in any *proper* sense sinful. There is nothing sinful but the sinful *will*.

Every man born of Adam inherits certain consequences of sin. The infant just born inherits already its natural consequences in the liability to disease and death. He does not inherit yet the actual spiritual and moral consequences, because He is not yet Himself a spiritual and moral subject. We do not properly call him, as yet, a sinner; for where there is not yet a law and a transgression of a law, there is not yet sin. But the child does inherit sin and transgression in the sense that he inherits a nature, unless he is redeemed from, or raised above, the inherited weakness or incapacity of which, he will inevitably sin and transgress his law. Whether the child lives or dies to his earthly environment, he carries in his nature an impotency from which he needs to be delivered, and unless he is delivered from which he is incapable of a free and full spiritual and moral, and therefore, also, natural, life. In one sense we may say that men are sinful by the fact of their nature, because actually all men who are of the nature of Adam sin. But suppose that *one* man who was of the nature of Adam did not sin: we should not then say that he was sinful by fact of his nature, if by act of himself, and in spite of his nature, he was actually sinless. The mere fact of the nature does not, then, properly speaking, constitute sinfulness, but only the personal sinning in the nature. St. Paul considers the σάρξ, or our nature in its fallen state, a slavery or bondage, because in it we are unable not to sin. And so, not only by him, but in the New Testament generally, the σάρξ is treated as, and called, sinful, but not because it is so in itself, for a *thing* cannot

be sinful; St. Paul himself lays down the principle that nothing but the personal transgression of a law is sin, and St. John defines sin to be transgression of law; but because the flesh lived in and personally yielded to and obeyed is sin; and because there is *no* holiness, or righteousness, or life, *i.e.* there is no sinlessness, which is not a victory over the flesh, and a redemption from the flesh, and a crucifixion of the flesh; in a word, which is not a triumph of ourselves over our nature, or a deliverance of ourselves from the bondage of our nature. When, therefore, St. Paul speaks exactly as in Rom. 7, he does not call the flesh itself, or the natural condition, even, of the flesh, sinful, but speaks of *sin in the flesh*, *i.e.* of the flesh as the *locus* or place of sin, as that *through which* sin finds its opportunity and exercises its power over us. The true essence of sin is not natural but spiritual and ethical; it is not in the flesh as a nature and our nature, but the flesh as it affects the spirit, as it obscures the reason, darkens the understanding, perverts the will, and corrupts the life. In all of us it *does* this, and so is sin; the flesh becomes fleshly or carnal *mindedness*, and *fleshly mindedness* is sin; not the flesh as nature, or even fallen nature, prior to its effect upon the mind or the spiritual person. For suppose, as I have said, that in the case of any person the flesh were *not* yielded to nor obeyed; suppose it were personally triumphed over, and trampled under foot, and wholly overcome, then, surely, he who had done so would not be called sinful by the mere fact of having had the σάρξ, when, so far from being overcome by and yielding to the possi-

bilities and temptations of sin in it, he had resisted and overcome and destroyed all these by a triumphant and complete personal sinlessness. In the case of such a person as I have just described, even though the flesh be called *in itself* sinful, and the mere being *in it* be considered a taking or having sin, yet assuredly the sin thus assumed is not the sin of the person, who according to the supposition is himself sinless. A person who is actually sinless in a so-called sinful nature, in spite of, and in triumph over, the *natural* impossibilities of sinlessness in it, is not less sinless than if he were so in a sinless nature. If, in receiving or assuming, as the case might be, the nature, he received or took the sin, it was in no sense sin *in him*, unless *he* was in some way overcome by it. If, on the contrary, he overcame and destroyed it in himself, in what way can it be said that he was personally compromised by his relation to, or contact with, sin? Such a person coming in our nature, and in our nature in its actual condition as the consequence of sin in the past, may be said to have taken, with our nature, *our sin*, but certainly no sin of *his own*, save, as through sympathy with us, he may be said to have taken our sin upon him, and made it his own, in order to remove it from us.

While practically and actually all men have sinned and do sin in the flesh or in the nature of Adam, and as long as we are *in the flesh* there is for us a *non possibilitas non peccandi*, an inability or impossibility of sinlessness, yet, in the very nature of God and of us and of our spiritual relationship with Him, there

is for us *in the spirit* a *possibilitas non peccandi*, or possibility of sinlessness. A man cannot in his nature and of his nature *free himself* from the weakness of his nature, but in God and of God in him he can *be freed* from it. He that lives in the spirit will no longer be dead in the flesh; he that is free in the spirit will be no longer under the slavery or bondage of the flesh; he that walks in the spirit will not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. But so to be in the spirit is a spiritual act or activity, and cannot be a mere natural fact on our part. It is the power and activity of the Holy Ghost in us, through our own faith, obedience, and personal, spiritual and moral, activity.

As in Adam we see the natural man, — or, since the Fall, man in bondage to his nature, the fleshly or carnal man, — so in Jesus Christ we recognize the perfect spiritual man. In Him the Holy Ghost was without measure, because His own faith and obedience were without measure. We might equally, of course, say that His faith and obedience were so because the Holy Ghost was given to Him without measure. Each is cause and each is effect of the other; or, if more exactly, we say that the Holy Ghost was cause, and His faith and self-surrender only the condition of our Lord's spiritual manhood, it comes to the same thing. The Holy Ghost was in Him without measure as the spirit and power and life of His spiritual manhood, of His personal human holiness and righteousness, only *through* His own human faith and perfect human self-surrender to it. His sinlessness, therefore, was not a mere fact and necessary consequence of a sinless flesh, but an act

of His free spirit. It was not the result of a mechanical acting of the Holy Ghost upon His impersonal human nature, making it sinless for Him, but the result of the spiritual acting of the Holy Ghost upon *Him*, making Him sinless in it. *It* did not make Him sinless, but *He* it; in a word, as I have said before, our Lord's sinlessness or holiness was not effect of His nature, but act of Himself. He was ὁ ἅγιος, the holy one of humanity, because, as regards His own humanity or human nature, He was ὁ ἁγιάζων, the sanctifier, or He who *made* humanity holy. He was in His own human life the τελειωτής, or finisher, perfecter, of human faith and obedience, and so of human holiness, righteousness, and life. It was *He* who, by His personal life in humanity, brought it into oneness with God, redeemed it from the power and bondage of sin, and raised it out of its death and corruption.

Further reasons will be given further on for the above position; I want here to call attention to the following point. It is quite beside the proper function of the Holy Ghost to ascribe to Him a merely mechanical effect upon the impersonal *nature*, or flesh, of Jesus Christ prior to any *personal* life of His own in it. The function of the Holy Ghost is *influence* and never mere *power;* it is the action of *spirit upon spirit*, and therefore is always upon *persons* and not *things*. Mere physical creation is never by the Holy Ghost; only spiritual creation is by Him. The essential distinction between natural and spiritual creation is *this:* that one is by the Word, the other is by the Word and the Spirit, or the Word through the

Spirit. Where the creation is merely *upon* and *without* (*i.e.* without the consciousness, will, and co-operation of) the subject, and is thus an exertion of mere power, it is by the Word: "By the Word of God were the heavens made." But where it is a creation *in* and *with* (*i.e.* involving and conditioned upon the consciousness, will, and co-operation of) the subject, and is therefore the effect not of mere power but of spiritual influence, it is still by the Word (for without the Word of God nothing is that is, except sin), but it is the Word by or through the Spirit. The working of the Spirit is always and only manifested in the subjective disposition and activity, in the free self-surrender, receptivity, and co-working of that in and with which it works. The Spirit, I repeat, does not work in or upon matter; it works in spirit, and reveals itself in the spirit of that in which it works. It was the Logos who incarnated Himself, or took flesh. If the flesh which He took was only impersonal human nature, He, *as Logos*, discharging all the personal functions in it, this might be correctly expressed by saying that He took flesh or became incarnate. When, however, it is said that He was incarnate *by the Holy Ghost*, it is asserted that it was not merely a physical but a spiritual and moral incarnation; *i.e.* an incarnation not only into the physical nature, but into the spiritual and moral functions and activities of a truly human personal life. Because, as has been said, the Holy Ghost acts upon and fashions only that in man which is spiritual, moral, and personal.

The prime error lies in supposing that when it is

said that the Eternal Logos and Son was incarnate (as, *e.g.*, in the Nicene Creed, "Who for us men and for our Salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary"), the expression *was incarnate* refers only to the initial act of assuming the nature. The consequence is that when it is added that He was incarnate *by the Holy Ghost*, it is then assumed that the part of the Holy Ghost was only to prepare the nature to be entered into, or assumed by, the Logos or Son. If this preparation were taken to mean the really *spiritual* preparation, by which, through many generations, the faith and personal receptivity of the Virgin Mother was made possible and was actually produced, there would be valuable truth in it. But mostly it is taken to mean a mechanical or material miracle, by which either all or some of the effects of the Fall are separated from the nature, and so the latter made ready and worthy for the use of the Incarnate Person. Thus our Lord is not Himself the sanctifier of the human nature He assumes, but assumes it sanctified for Him by a miracle in the moment either of His own conception, or, as it is now held by many, of the immaculate conception of His mother. When, however, we say that He who from eternity was God of God, light of light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father; by Whom all things were made; that He the Divine Logos and Son, for us men and for our Salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost; although we say that this was of the Virgin Mary from whom immediately He took His human-

ity, yet the words "was incarnate" do not mean the isolated initial act only of His physical conception and birth, but the whole process of His so entering into humanity as to be *its* incarnation of the Divine Logos as well as the Divine Logos so incarnate in it. And that He was incarnate *by the Holy Ghost* refers to the part which the Third Person of the Trinity took in the completed Incarnation. Which was, as was anciently expressed, *aptare hominem Deo*, or *parare spiritalem hominem*. That is, not by a physical miracle to prepare the flesh, or the impersonal human *nature*, which was to be assumed in the act of conception; for, for that, the Divine Word would have sufficed without the Divine Spirit, but it was to prepare the spirit, the will, the personal self-activity of the humanity assumed; to fit to and blend with the God in our Lord the man who was also in Him. For, as I have said, without in any sense being two persons, a divine and a human, our Lord had a two-fold personality; and He as much, as a human person, became one with and incarnated the divine, as, as a divine person, He incarnated Himself in the human.

If it be suggested that, supposing the Nicene Creed to be susceptible of this interpretation, the Apostles' Creed is not, where it is distinctly said that Jesus Christ was *conceived by the Holy Ghost*, born of the Virgin Mary, etc., I answer as follows: We may readily see here how what may be shown to be a false interpretation of the creed has been one of the causes of the practical confining of the part of the Holy Ghost in the act of the Incarnation to the mere physical preparation of the flesh for His conception

into it. In the first place, "the Holy Ghost" in this place in the Apostles' Creed must be interpreted in accordance with St. Matt. 1 : 20 and St. Luke 1 : 35, with which two passages the section in the creed is inseparably connected. Now in both these passages "Holy Ghost" (in both cases πνεῦμα ἅγιον and not τὸ πν. ἅγ.) is not *the Holy Ghost* in the exactness of later Trinitarian language. It means the *whole* divine part and agency in the act of the Incarnation, including therefore that of the Logos as well as that of the Holy Ghost. It covers all that is more fully expressed in the Nicene Creed, where it is said that the only begotten *Son* was incarnate *by the Holy Ghost* of the Virgin Mary. Unless we interpret these passages in this way, in which it can be proved that the Church of the age which produced the Apostles' Creed *did* interpret them, there is no recognition in them of the part of the Logos Himself in the act of His assuming human nature; and the "Holy Thing" which was born of the Virgin is made the incarnation only of the Holy Ghost. As indeed has been asserted by certain modern theologians in opposition to the existence from the beginning of Trinitarian doctrine in Christianity.

Of course from the beginning both Divine Word and Divine Spirit are always present and always engaged in the process or act of incarnation; the Word as not merely physically but spiritually incarnating Himself in humanity; and the Spirit as *aptans hominem Deo*, as the principle in the humanity of that spiritual faith and obedience in and through which the Word is incarnated; in other words, as spiritu-

ally preparing and enabling the humanity to incarnate, or be the incarnation of, the Divine Word.

As I have said before, the Logos was conceived and born in and of not merely the physical but the spiritual womb of the Virgin, and of the race. The true seed of Abraham was the fruit not so much of his flesh as of his faith. Throughout the whole process of the coming of the Son of God into our nature and into ourselves; in the preparation of the world for His coming; in His actual coming and manifestation of Himself in our flesh; and in the extension of His incarnation and impartation of Himself to us through the Church as His body, the Holy Ghost is the principle and agent of the subjective preparation and enabling of humanity for the not merely physical but spiritual conception and birth in it of the objective Word of God. He prepared the Virgin's faith as well as her womb; and her womb only through her faith, for His operation or ἐνέργεια is primarily and essentially spiritual and not physical, and only secondarily physical as personality affects nature, and spirit matter. In that which was born then of the Word and the world, of the Logos and man, viz. in Jesus Christ Himself, the Holy Ghost is manifested as the principle of His perfect spiritual *manhood*, *i.e.* as has been so often said, of that perfect human faith and human obedience through and in which He personally and freely *as man* incarnated the Divine Word and sonship. And still with *us*, in the Church through which as His body our Lord incarnates Himself in all who are in Him, as the Word is the principle of the objective revela-

tion of God to us, so the Holy Ghost is the principle of our subjective appropriation of Him or of *our* incarnating Him in ourselves.

In the divine human personality of our Lord we have, of course, to guard against lowering the great truth of the hypostatic union to the level of that mystical union in which even we are one with God, and God may truly be said to incarnate Himself in us. Our oneness with the Divine Logos is not a unity of person, but a union of persons. We are one with Him *only* in the spiritual union of faith and the moral union of obedience, and so by consequence in the union of a common life. This is what we call the *mystical*, or spiritual and moral, union. Jesus Christ is not two persons, a divine and a human, united into one in the perfection of a spiritual or mystical union. He is essentially one person uniting in Himself two natures, and this is what we call the hypostatic union.

But the two natures in our Lord are at least two *modes of personality*, the *one* person *as God* and *as man;* and as man just as much a human person as, as God, a divine person. As man He as truly represents men in their relation to God, as truly *is* man in the perfection of his relation to God, as, as God, He *is* God in the perfection of His relation to man. We cannot deny to our Lord, then, *under* the hypostatic, the reality also of the mystical union. Was He not *as man* in a perfect spiritual and moral union, in the union of a perfect human faith and obedience, with God; and is not this the mystical union? And does it deny or impair the doctrine of

the hypostatic union, or the doctrine of the unity of the person of our Lord, to hold and assert, as I now do, that if God became man He became perfect man, *i.e.* man perfectly *as man* realizing and fulfilling the true concept and predestination of manhood? Which is, by a perfect spiritual faith, by a perfect moral obedience, and in a perfect human life, so to realize the divine mind and will and purpose as at once to fulfil God in himself and himself in God.

But let us return in closing to the true point of the present chapter, which is this: If the Incarnation was truly *by the Holy Ghost*, was a spiritual and not a mere physical one, then the holiness of Jesus Christ was of the Holy Ghost *in Him*, and not merely *in His nature*. The nature was not holy in Him, He was holy in it; it was not the cause of His holiness, but He was the cause of its holiness. This does not make our Lord one whit less, or less truly, sinless; but it does make His sinlessness *His own*, in the sense of its being not a mere fact of His human nature miraculously wrought for Him prior to His entering into it, but an act wrought by Himself in the nature. It makes Him in His personal human holiness, righteousness and life, the sanctifier, redeemer, and regenerator of human nature and humanity.

The above view of the matter is, as we shall see, in accordance with the New Testament representation of the matter. It is in harmony with a true understanding of the proper function of the Holy Ghost as spiritual and not physical. It is in accord with spiritual science in general, and in particular with a correct science of human Salvation.

CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

OF THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS CHRIST. — *Continued.*

But what seems to me to be the conclusive reason why we must hold that our Lord's sinlessness is personal and not natural — not of a sinless nature, but of His own sinlessness in the nature — is the following.

It would not, of course, militate against the verity of His *humanity* if the Word had assumed a human nature in no way affected or impaired by the Fall. The fact of having, or being, fallen is in no degree — at least, from a sublapsarian standpoint — an essential element in the conception or constitution of humanity. It is indeed essential to it that it should have had the possibility and opportunity of standing or falling, but to say that it must necessarily have fallen would be to make the Fall a merely natural and necessary, and not a spiritual and moral fact. But to have passed successfully through the possibility and opportunity — *i.e.* through the probation, prior to and without which a spiritual and moral personality is not possible — without falling, would not make humanity less human, but more so, than if it had and were fallen. Neither would a holiness

acquired, or an obedience rendered, in an unfallen human nature be on that account *not* a human holiness or obedience. It does not, therefore, militate against the very humanity of Jesus Christ if we should say that the human nature which He assumed was so much an unfallen nature that it had in it none whatsoever of the consequences of the fall of the race.

But the point I make is *this:* Not that the human holiness, righteousness, and life of Jesus Christ, if they had taken place in an unfallen nature, would not have been very real and very human, but that they would not have been *Salvation*. *Holiness* in a nature which simply passes from not-yet-holy into holy, from the as-yet-natural into the spiritual, from incompleteness in itself into completeness in God, — such a holiness is holiness, but it is not Salvation. The transition from one stage to the other would still be necessary. For if man is made to incarnate the personal God and to be a partaker of the divine nature and life, he must needs do this. And after by grace through faith he has done so, or to the extent that he has done so, he is different in nature and life from what he was before. This difference we call holiness; and the man before we call the natural man, and the man after it the spiritual man. But if it is the divine order of things that there should be first the natural and then the spiritual, and both are good and neither evil, there is no *Salvation* involved in the transition or translation from one to the other. So it is with an *obedience* rendered in an unfallen nature. Just as one *is not* by his nature, but has by

a personal act — or act of his own — of faith to *become* holy, so one has, even in an unfallen nature, to *become* righteous through his own conscious and free, or personal, obedience. Innocence is not righteousness; but neither is it unrighteousness, but only not-yet-righteousness. It is not yet either righteousness or unrighteousness, because it has not yet had the probation, the power and opportunity of personal choice and decision, which is necessary not merely to prove, but to make it, one or the other. But when innocence has through trial passed into and become obedience or righteousness, it is certainly righteousness and human righteousness, but it is not in any sense *Salvation*. For Salvation does not mean a normal transition or translation from a lower into a higher good, but a deliverance from an *evil* into a good. So yet once more is it with *life* in an unfallen nature. The life of and in nature may need to pass or be taken up into the life of and in God. So with us regeneration, or the birth of God and the life of God into and in our life, is a necessity for our complete self-realization and perfection. But the regeneration of an unfallen being involves no possible idea or element of Salvation.

What *does* involve and constitute Salvation in each of the above points of view is this: that in the actual condition of the nature which we all inherit, holiness, righteousness, and life do come to us as deliverance from a natural state of separation from God, transgression of our law, and death of ourselves, which we call the Fall.

1st. The nature of Salvation requires, then, that

the *holiness* involved should be one into which we come, or are brought, *out of* a condition in which we were actually unholy, or at least subject to an inherited necessity of unholiness, through inherited weakness of spiritual *nature*. It is not a being brought into union and oneness with God only, but a being brought into it *out of* a state of natural separation, or spiritual and moral difference, from Him. It is a *re*union, reconciliation, or at-one-ment with Him.

2d. It requires that the *obedience* should be one into which we are brought *out of* a condition of disobedience. Obedience is freedom, but freedom is only Salvation, when it is a being *set free*, a deliverance, emancipation, or redemption, from unfreedom — *i.e.* from bondage or slavery.

3d. That *life* should be Salvation requires that it should be life out of death — *i.e.* out of a condition in which it is subject to that which hinders, contradicts, or destroys it. In a word, a life which is a *Salvation* must be, not merely a regeneration, but a resurrection.

Now I hold that in a very real sense Jesus Christ *saved* us; and that He was Himself, and is, our *Salvation*. That is, that He was, and is, not only our holiness, but our sanctification, or making holy from unholy; not only our righteousness, but our redemption, or making free from unrighteousness; not only our life, but our resurrection from death.

Salvation as a mere notion might be abstractly expressed or defined. Salvation in itself, or in fact, is a concrete act or process, and cannot take place or

be outside of or apart from that which is saved or being saved. God has no more given us an abstract Salvation than He has revealed to us an abstract or impersonal faith or righteousness. *Jesus Christ* is *His* revelation and gift to us of righteousness and Salvation. And Jesus Christ is Salvation, because in Him — *i.e.* in His personal human holiness, righteousness, and life — humanity is saved. In *Him, in the nature He assumed*, we see the thing to be saved. In *His holiness, righteousness, and life in that nature* we see the atonement, redemption, and resurrection of the thing — *i.e.* its Salvation. And in *Him sanctified, perfected, and glorified in the nature He had assumed* we see the thing saved. And that is Salvation, not in the mere idea or formal definition of it, but in the realized idea or reality of it.

The difficulty here is, of course, that it seems to represent our Lord as having been Himself saved from sin, and therefore as having Himself assumed or been made sin in a sense which might compromise His essential deity. But let us carefully consider these points.

In every man there is something impersonal and common to all men; and there is something personal which constitutes himself. The first we call human nature, and in the New Testament it is called σάρξ (sarx). It is this which Jesus Christ shared with all men, and which constituted Him *man*. I use the term sarx, or flesh, as synonymous with the *nature of man*. I shall not undertake to give a scientific definition of nature in general, or of human nature. It is sufficient for our purpose to say that it is that

which is universal, or generic, in man, not merely as contradistinguished from what is individual and particular, but from what is *personal*. The personal in one is the self, and all that originates from the self as an ἀρχή, or source, of conscious and free origination, or self-determination. By the sarx, or flesh, is meant, of course, not only the bodily nature, but the whole nature. Thus it is the seat and source not only of possible and actual lust, but of such less material passions as pride, envy, hatred, etc. From the New Testament and Christian point of view the flesh, even *unfallen*, is the ground of the possibility of sinning; *fallen*, it is the ground of the impossibility of not sinning, which is the specific mark of our present condition.

According to Kant, the possibility of moral evil lies in the fact that we are tempted by the natural will of sensibility or inclination to depart from and transgress the true law of the reason, or personal and moral will. Bishop Butler shows that even an unfallen being naturally constituted like man must, from the very nature of propension, be not only capable of falling, but tempted to fall, and in danger of falling. There must come a time when the will of the reason and the attraction of the sensibility, *i.e.* the will of the *person* and the inclination of the *nature*, will not coincide, and one or the other must yield. Herein lies the possibility, in a moral being, of transgression or departure from the moral law, the law of reason and the free will; and, in a spiritual being, of separation from God, or sin. Where there is no formal freedom or power of choice, and so at

least possibility of moral wrong or spiritual evil, there is also no possibility of moral right or spiritual good. Holiness, for an unfallen being, would consist in the choosing God against the opposite possibility of choosing self apart from or outside of God. But the self out of God can only be the self of natural inclination; *i.e.* the self inclined in the direction of some one of the natural propensions, or the propensions of the flesh. It thus becomes a question between the person as λόγικος and πνευμάτικος, in his relation and allegiance to God, his reason and his law, and the person as σάρκικος, in his *nature*, and as liable to be led astray by its inclinations and propensions. And this latter, even though the natural propensions are as yet normal and ordinate; *i.e.* not inordinately strengthened by indulgence, but only capable of being indulged and of being tempted to indulgence against reason and the free will. The question lies, I say, between that true selfhood, whose nature is holiness and whose law is righteousness, which realizes itself in God by faith and in His law by obedience, and that other and false selfhood which is separated from God and alienated from His law by subjection to the sensibilities and inclinations of the flesh.

Do we not see that there are these two, and *only* these two, things in man, — his spiritual and moral *personality* and his sarkical or fleshly *nature:* and that the only possibility of sin and transgression for him lies in his sacrificing the *personal*, *i.e.* the spiritual and moral, in him to the merely *natural* or fleshly? He is good and right as *he* subjects and controls his

nature; he is necessarily evil and wrong as he is subject to and controlled by his nature. For if that is not controlled by the personal will, there is nothing else to make and keep it at one with God and His law.

Now suppose our Lord to have assumed a human nature, unfallen and in nowise affected or impaired by the Fall, and *in it* to have been holy and righteous. If it was in reality a *human* holiness and righteousness, we can define precisely how and what it must have been. It would have been a free personal, spiritual, and moral *choice* of God and God's will, against an opposite possible choice of some form or sort of *self* willing and acting. It would have been a *Not my will but Thine*, *Not I but Thou*, against not only the temptation to, but the possibility of, a *Not Thine but mine*, *Not Thou but I*. Nothing other than this would be a human obedience. A perfected and completed human holiness and righteousness might be defined to be a *possibilitas peccandi* converted by personal faith and obedience into a *non possibilitas peccandi*, formal freedom lost in real freedom. Though the formal freedom, or power of choice of good or evil, ought no longer to exist, yet it must have existed and been personally overcome and surrendered, to constitute any obedience a *human* obedience, if not, indeed, to constitute it an *obedience* at all. If, then, our Lord took a wholly unimpaired human nature, still His holiness and righteousness in it must have been such as we have defined a human holiness and righteousness to be. If, in predicating this of Him, we necessarily attribute to Him in His

human nature, and as the condition of His human obedience, the *possibilitas peccandi*, we are not responsible for that. It cannot possibly be avoided, because it is contained and expressed in the incontestable assertion that He became *man*. I do not deny that to speak thus involves us in metaphysical and logical difficulties and seeming contradictions, but no more and no greater than are already involved in the fact of a real incarnation. All we need say is this: Of course our Lord was sinless in His human nature; but if He chose, for the purposes of human Salvation, to be sinless not by annihilating its possibility of sin *as God*, but by overcoming and destroying it *as man*, shall we deny Him the power to do so because we are unable to understand it?

We therefore are forced, looking at Him from the human side, to predicate of Jesus Christ the possibility of sin; and to say that this was overcome and destroyed in Him, not by the fact of His Godhead, but by the act of His manhood. That is, that it was His own triumphant holiness, righteousness, and life as man that overcame in Him the possibility and possible consequences of sin. It is impossible to read the New Testament and not to recognize the fact that the personal human holiness, righteousness, and life of Christ are essential factors in His work of human Salvation. When He is said to be *our* holiness, *our* righteousness, and *our* life, we know that He could only be so as He was in Himself the realization and the reality of the human holiness, righteousness, and life which He is to be in us.

Now the point which I wish to make in this chapter

is this: That Jesus Christ — in the same *real* way in which we say that He *is*, in Himself and in us, our holiness, righteousness, and life — *is* our *Salvation*, or our sanctification, redemption, and resurrection from all unholiness, disobedience, and death, as these are inherent in our flesh or fallen nature. To have been our holiness, etc., if *we had been unfallen*, would have required only that the Lord, our holiness, should have been Himself holy in an unfallen nature. For we have seen that, even if there were no Fall, we should still have needed the objective incarnation for us as well as the subjective incarnation in us of the Lord, our holiness, our righteousness, and our life.

But seeing that we are fallen, and that our Lord must be our *Saviour* before He can be our Finisher or Completer, the work to be done by Him has to be done not in an unfallen but in a fallen nature. For in the same *real* way in which, even though we were not fallen, the Lord, in order to be our life, — *i.e.* our life from above, our regenerate or spiritual or divine life, — would have needed *Himself first* to be the regenerate, spiritual, divine *man*, the first begotten from the natural into the spiritual, the beginner of the new order, — *just so*, now that we are fallen, the Lord, in order to be our life, has first Himself to be our resurrection, the raised, redeemed, and sanctified *man*, the *first begotten from the dead*. He is the resurrection and the life, and the resurrection as truly as the life.

What our Lord was and what He did as our Saviour, He was and did, therefore, in our nature, as it is. If in assuming the nature He assumed its sin,

it was *our* sin He took in order by *His* sinlessness to overcome and destroy it. And are we not told that He came in order that by taking He might take away our sin? Did not God send Him in the flesh of sin that He might destroy sin in the flesh, *i.e.* in our fallen nature? He took sin, in so far as sin was a fact of the nature, in order that by His act in the nature sin might be destroyed.

When it is said in the Epistle to the Galatians that Jesus Christ was made of a woman, *made under the law*, it is meant that He took our nature in that condition in which we say that it is under the condemnation and curse of the law. The *fact* that in our flesh, as it is, we are naturally subject to sin and death constitutes in itself a natural condemnation and curse. The fact that our Lord in our flesh was subject to natural death in it, and was only *not* subject to spiritual and moral death because He Himself destroyed sin and transgression in it, proves that, so far as the flesh or nature He assumed was concerned, He put Himself under its condemnation and curse, and that thus by His personal act He overcame and destroyed the condemnation and curse of it. "God sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the law, that He might redeem those who were under the law." And just as His being *our* righteousness presupposes His *Himself* being *the righteous one* (Jesus Christ, ὁ δίκαιος), the personal author in Himself of the human righteousness which He makes ours; just as His being our life implies that in Him first as man humanity has come into the life which in Him is life for all men, so that *because He lives*, *we* shall live, *just*

so He is the redemption of all who are under the law, because He is Himself humanity, or man made free from the bondage of the law. As to His nature as man, or His flesh, He was under the law, its condemnation and its curse; He "was made or became a curse for us"; by His crucifixion of the flesh of sin, and abolishment of sin in the flesh, He became the redemption of humanity from the bondage of the flesh, the remover of its condemnation and destroyer of its curse.

We saw above that if Jesus Christ, even in an unfallen nature, for unfallen man, was to be *human* righteousness, He must be what alone a human righteousness is. That is, out of an actual formal freedom, or freedom *either* to subject the flesh to the spirit, or the spirit to the flesh, He must personally and freely have chosen and accomplished the former. Having done so, He would be ὁ πνευμάτικος, the spiritual man, which it is the calling and predestination of every man to become through Him.

Now in the same way if, we being fallen, Jesus Christ is to be *human*, not righteousness merely, but *redemption* (just as also He is not life only, but *resurrection*), then He must be what alone human redemption is. He must become, first, *the thing to be redeemed;* He must, secondly, be *the redemption* of that thing; and thirdly, He must be in His own person that thing *redeemed*. The thing to be redeemed is man under the bondage of his nature or flesh. Our Lord must therefore have become man in that condition. Observe, however, that He is under the flesh or fallen nature of man *only* in so far as it is

His assumed *nature* prior to or outside of what *He personally* is and does in it; *i.e.* so far as the *fact* of the nature prior to His *act* in the nature. For if He personally had, in any way, as we all do, yielded to or been overcome by the flesh or nature, or fallen under its power and bondage, He would not have been redemption or emancipation from it. He was redemption because in the nature He broke its bondage; and He did this by being personally sinless in a nature whose hitherto unbroken law was sin. How this could be done, and was done, by Him only upon that *cross* to which He nailed the flesh of sin; upon which He crucified not only all proclivity, but all possibility of sin, and so entered upon the *real* freedom of a human *non possibilitas peccandi*, we shall see more clearly hereafter. *Now* we see in our crucified, risen, and ascended Lord *the thing redeemed; i.e.* man, humanity, in His person *made free* from the law of sin and death, and restored to the freedom of obedience, to the true law of the spirit of life. And He is *our* redemption; it is only as we see redemption objectively realized in Him that we can subjectively realize it in ourselves; if we believe in it in Him, He will be it in us. "We are partakers of Christ and with Christ if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end."

Do we sacrifice or imperil anything of what a truly catholic theology has labored through all the ages to protect and defend, in the above analysis and description of the human sinlessness of our Lord? It may seem to, or may in fact, sometimes differ from the traditional methods and language of defence,

but does it lay an unbelieving or irreverent finger upon the thing defended and to be forever defended? Then let it all go; for to impugn or impair by remotest corollary or consequence the Christian presupposition of the essential human sinlessness and the very personal deity of the incarnate Son of God is to lay an impious finger upon the spiritual, moral, and natural order of the universe, and to err against the true nature, dignity, and destination of man. What, in the views above expressed, may seem to savor of Nestorianism, or of the later Adoptionism, let it be asked, in all fairness and love of and desire for truth, whether it is not the *truth* which these systems sought and not the *error* into which they fell. With regard to them both it cannot be denied that the Church has so violently reacted from their error that it has yet to do justice to their truth. It is the truth and not the error in them which is here sought, and if with the former any of the latter has entered in unawares, let it be exposed in order that it may be expelled. Upon the more serious point of the assertion that, in a more *real* sense than has hitherto been generally accepted, our Lord in the flesh He assumed took our sin and was made a curse for us, enough has been said, I trust, upon which to request a somewhat further suspension of judgment; and much more will be said in explanation and justification.

CHAPTER SIXTEENTH.

OF THE HUMAN NATURE OF JESUS CHRIST.

But now let us appeal to the New Testament itself. There is no question, of course, as to the reality or verity of the human nature, or flesh, which our Lord assumed. It is as to the *condition* of the nature; whether it had in it as he took it all the natural consequences of the Fall, *i.e.* all the consequences of the Fall so far as these extend to and affect the mere *nature* of every man prior to any *personal* activity or life in it. Every man inherits in his flesh not only such physical consequences of the Fall as bodily disease and death, but such, what might be improperly called, moral or spiritual consequences as are, also improperly, expressed by the term *Original Sin.* I say improperly, because what is moral or spiritual, as sin or holiness, can properly be predicated only of persons and personal acts, and not of the mere nature prior to personality. As a matter of fact all men (save One) are through the inherited weakness of their nature actually involved in moral and spiritual consequences of the Fall and subject to sin; but it is not inconceivable that one should, or should

have, though subject to all the natural consequences, overcome so as *not* to be subject to the spiritual and moral or personal consequences of the Fall. The ἀσθένεια, or weakness, of the flesh as an organ of the spirit amounts to a natural inability of the spirit in the flesh to obey its law, and this constitutes our bondage and our need of redemption. But though the spirit is unable, it is not inconceivable or impossible that it should be *enabled* to put off the corruption and bondage and death of the flesh and be raised to its proper power, freedom, and life. As the Fall constituted Adam the fleshly or carnal man, so His reversal of the Fall constituted Jesus Christ the pneumatical or spiritual man. That is, as Adam was he in whom the spirit fell under the bondage of the flesh, so Jesus Christ is He in whom the flesh thus become dominant was subdued to the spirit, and the spirit which had become subject was delivered out of its bondage and raised out of its subjection to the flesh. The Divine Logos in becoming incarnate in one who was to be our not only completion but Salvation — *i.e.* our at-one-ment, or bringing into one with God; our redemption, or being set free from the power of sin; our resurrection, or raising up out of the death of our natural condition — took our nature and entered into our condition *as it is*, and did that and became that which was necessary for the spirit in Him, and through Him in us, not merely to be naturally dominant over an unfallen flesh, but victorious over and resurgent from a fallen flesh. He, in our nature as it is, subdued the enthroned flesh to the dethroned spirit, and so became the reverser

of what had taken place in Adam and the restorer of our lost liberty and life.

So far as my own view of the exact propriety of the terms goes, it would not have occurred to me to say that our Lord, in assuming our fallen nature, *took sin*. Not that in the light of the New Testament and of the Christian consciousness from the beginning I think there ought to be any danger of misapprehending what is intended by the expression, nor that, properly understood, I should feel any metaphysical or moral hesitation in using it. For, as I have said before, it cannot mean that He did, or could, take sin to *Himself* as God, or to *Himself* as man, but only that He took it in so far as it is (or may be said to be) *in the nature;* which He took for the express purpose of destroying sin in it, and so purging it from sin, by His own sinlessness or holiness in it. *So* taking sin, it would not be *His* sin, but *ours*, which he took, and took in order to take away. There should be no shock to our spiritual or religious feelings, to our reverence for God and His divine Incarnation, in so speaking. On the contrary, it should deepen our sense of the divine love and condescension which is God's chiefest and divinest glory. It gives reality to the thought that God has indeed descended to us to raise us up to Himself, to feel that He has not only taken our nature to unite it to His own, that He has not only entered into our impotency to raise it up to his omnipotency, but that He has taken upon Him *all* that belongs to our fallen nature and condition — yea, even our sin, that He might wash it out in His blood and cleanse us

from it in His own divine purity and holiness. Still, I should not myself have coupled sin in even this, or in any, way with God or with our incarnate Lord. For I should not have held that the so-called sin of nature is sin at all. It might be a natural bias or inclination or proclivity to sin; it might constitute in us a natural impossibility of not sinning, as St. Paul says that the law cannot produce righteousness in us on account of the *weakness* of our flesh. But *whatever* be the fault or corruption of the nature of every man who is born of Adam, it is not *in itself* properly sin, but only becomes so in the will and personal activity of the man himself. When the man *does* sin, as every man sins, we may then trace it back — not, as I was about to say, to its origination in the nature, for sin cannot originate in the impersonal nature, but only in a person, but — to the temptation or the weakness in the nature which made it impossible for him *not* to sin; and in this way we may attribute the sin to a so-called sinful nature, or flesh. *But* if one in the selfsame nature personally *does not sin*, so resists, overcomes, subdues, and destroys the sin of the nature as to be Himself absolutely sinless in it, how can we in any way predicate sin of Him? I find myself still speaking of the sin of the nature when I mean only the temptation to sin in the nature, or the weakness of the nature for sinlessness or holiness. But call it sin and, so explained and so understood, does it in any way compromise either our Lord's divinity or His holy humanity to have taken it? I believe that our Lord felt all the temptation and all the weakness which is

inherent in the nature we have inherited from Adam. He was only *not* tempted as we are in so far as our temptations come, as they mainly do, from previously entertained and indulged sin on our own part, *i.e.* from previous actual or personal sin. He could not be so tempted, because in Him there was no such sin. To say that He felt all the temptation and the weakness, and in this sense took the so-called sin *of the nature*, is only imputing sin to *Him* on the supposition that in His personal consciousness and will He to any extent took it to Himself and made it His own. On the supposition that He *did not*, then, however He bore or felt all the consequences of Adam's sin or man's sin through His nature or sarx, He in no other sense *took sin*.

I will go further right here and say that if our Lord was the one exception above described, if He alone in our flesh was sinless, it is not because He was in our flesh, unlike us, *able* of Himself to be sinless. He has revealed to us in His human person and in His human sinlessness *how* in the inability of the flesh man may be *enabled* to be sinless. As Abraham begat Isaac not by his natural powers of reproduction, but by the Word of God through his faith, so Jesus Christ overcame the weakness and the temptations of His flesh not by His human ability to do so, but by the power of the Divine Word incarnating Himself through His human faith in His human sinlessness or holiness. His sinlessness was indeed that of the Logos, but the Logos by the Holy Ghost fulfilling Himself in the personal faith, obedience, and life of *the man*.

But to come back to the point now before us. I should, I repeat once more, have hesitated to predicate sin not only, of course, of our Lord Himself in His human nature, but of the human nature itself of our Lord. But *the Scriptures* feel no such hesitation or reluctance. *They* do not hesitate, as we shall see — as we should long ago have seen but for our unworthy fears of compromising our Lord's true divinity and our unworthy desire like Peter to save Him from the extent and consequences of His own utter and (as we think) self-compromising love, forgetting that God, like us, can only be compromised by *any* limitation of His love, *i.e.* of His self-emptying and self-imparting condescension — the Scriptures, I say, do not hesitate to say that our Lord in some very true and real way, the meaning of which I have endeavored and shall further endeavor to explain, *took sin.* That He did so in any merely imputative, or otherwise fictitious or make-believe sense it is impossible to suspect, much less to derive, from the New Testament. He took our σάρξ with those consequences in it of our sin which become in us in turn causes of sin, and which, therefore, the Scriptures in their fearlessness do not hesitate to *call* sin. Inasmuch as they *did not* cause sin in Him, but were in him extinguished by His own personal sinlessness, they were not properly sin in Him. But inasmuch as they are in all save Him not only inherited effects, but effectual causes or occasions of sin, they are themselves, improperly, *called* sin. I mean *improperly* not in the sense of wrongly or incorrectly, but in the sense of popularly or loosely, and not with

logical or scientific exactness. The Scriptures are more popular and practical than scientific and exact, and it can easily be proved from themselves that they use language with no intention of logical precision, but in its popular and common sense. The matter is of such delicacy and importance, however, that I must here repeat that, even supposing *it were* properly sin which He took in His assumed nature, so far from *this* compromising *Him* in His personality, either as human or divine, it would only add lustre to the stupendous condescension of His love in *becoming sin for us that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.* This makes Him *indeed* the author and perfecter in Himself of our sinlessness, as the Scriptures consistently represent Him to be. It makes Him literally and actually our holiness, our righteousness, and our life. That He who *knew* no sin (*i.e.* who *personally*, whether as God or man, was incapable of sinning) was made sin for us that we might in Him (*i.e.* first in His person and secondly in ourselves in union with His person) become the righteousness of God (2 Cor. 5 : 21), means, if it means anything, that He became just what we are in the fallen condition of our nature in order that by His destruction of sin in our nature, by His crucifixion in His own body of the sinful in our nature, He might be our redemption from the sin of our nature, and our restoration to the freedom and life of God's own holiness and righteousness. But let us in a more orderly manner analyze the teaching of the New Testament, coming gradually to those passages in which the above position is most distinctly affirmed.

To begin with, what is the meaning of the *Cross of Christ?* That cross apart from which and what it symbolizes Jesus Christ cannot be thought at all! For it expresses the very principle and essence of all that He was and did in our nature. He Himself has taught us under His figure of the *daily cross* to see in it not merely the instrument of His one final physical death, but that of His lifelong daily spiritual and moral self-crucifixion. We have only anywhere and everywhere to see how all the New Testament writers interpret the Cross of Christ to see clearly enough what it means. It nowhere is merely the badge of martyrdom, the symbol of the spirit with which Christ bore it, and in which we ought not to hesitate "cheerfully and manfully to bear persecutions, troubles, distresses." No, the Cross of Christ is that invisible instrument of self-denial, self-mortification, self-crucifixion, by means of which in the human life and by the human faith, obedience and self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the σάρξ, or flesh of sin, was subdued to the πνεῦμα, or spirit of holiness and life. And so the second Adam diametrically reverses the act of the first, and the rising again of the one obliterates and effaces the fall of the other. Thus, according to St. Paul, "our old man was crucified with Christ." His death was the extinction of what is known in the New Testament as the old man, the flesh or body of sin, etc. In the sense of crucifixion in which our Lord is said, in many passages, to have in His body crucified the flesh with all those affections in it that are the causes in us of sin, it is very certain that He Himself crucified *something*, or

that *something in Him* was crucified. We have seen from Kant, Bishop Butler, and others, that in a nature like ours, even where it is unfallen, there is always a possibility or liability of falling, arising from the very fact of *natural propension*. That is, there is danger that sensibility shall prevail over reason, the flesh shall conquer the spirit, and the will of the *person* fall under the dominance of the propensions and inclinations of the *nature*. Which *possibilitas cadendi* would need to be overcome by the continued right use of reason and free will, by the constant practice and exercise of faith, obedience, etc., until these are confirmed and strengthened into a *non possibilitas cadendi*. The principle of the cross might thus be said to find a place in the faith and obedience of one in even an unfallen nature, inasmuch as there is there the denial and overcoming of at least the possibility of sin and of real opportunities and temptations to sin. But it is apparent at once that *cross* and *crucifixion* are too strong terms for the expression of only that amount of self-sacrifice or self-denial. They imply not only the prevention but the cure. They imply, that is, not the painless exclusion of something that *might* enter into us, but the painful extinction of something which *has* entered into us. One who is unfallen may not yet be what, or all that, he is to be. He may have yet a very great deal to become; but he certainly has not in him anything to un-be and undo which requires such an instrument as the cross and such a process as crucifixion. We can perfectly well understand how an original act, and long-continued and repeated acts, of sin might entail

upon humanity what may be called a nature of sin — *i.e.* a nature in which sinlessness has become, humanly speaking, impossible. Nature and personality marvellously act and react upon each other; and while we say that what is personal in one is never purely φύσει, is never merely the effect of the nature, but always the act of the person, yet we do not hold that the person can act independently of the nature, or that the freedom and power of personal action may not be impaired and lost by abnormal conditions of the nature. In this way the person, and every person, who inherits such a nature may become the slave of a perverted nature, and unable, without *redemption* from its bondage, to be himself, or to attain his personal freedom and life. That such is our condition according to the New Testament I do not think can be denied. And here I wish to make an assertion upon the truth of which depends that of the present theory or view of human Salvation.

Salvation is never, in the New Testament, represented as a mere release from condemnation, or acquittal from the *guilt* of past sins. We might say that there is no such thing as a past sin. Sins are never past; they are forever present in us in what we are by consequence of them, in our own further separation from God, and our increased inability to obey His law and realize His righteousness. We *do* need to be saved from all our past sins and from the sins of our fathers, the consequences of which we inherit and the burden of which we still bear. But our Salvation consists *not* in some one's performing a vicarious act or enduring a vicarious penalty which

has the effect of a formal and objective satisfaction to the nature, the justice, or the divine government of God for their moral or abstract guilt; *but* it consists in some one's doing, or having done, for us and in us that which will break the power over us of the inherited nature, of the accumulated and consolidated consequences in our nature, which those sins have entailed upon us. Who shall deliver me from the slavery of this σάρξ, from the power and bondage of this flesh of sin, from this impotency of my πνεῦμα, of my personal, spiritual, moral selfhood, to assert itself against the tyrannous power over it of the nature which ought to be its obedient servant, and is the only organ and instrument of its own activity! *That* is the cry for Salvation, and the cry to which the Salvation of the New Testament responds. "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord," through Jesus Christ in whom the σάρξ of humanity is crucified, dead, and buried, and the πνεῦμα raised up: that is, brought back into oneness with the spirit of God, restored to obedience to His law, and filled with the perfection and blessedness of His divine life. As the judicial, penal, or punitive justice of God, what the Scriptures call His condemnation, anger, or wrath, all comes and is revealed only in the natural consequences of sin and transgression; *i.e.* in the effect of these upon our nature and upon us through our nature (as St. Paul teaches in the latter half of Rom. 1), so Salvation is our liberation or redemption from these consequences, from that condition of our nature or that false acquired nature which separates us from God, from righteousness, and

from our own real life and blessedness. "The soul that sinneth it shall die" expresses as natural and necessary a sequence of cause and effect as any other in nature. It means that the loss of faith and obedience (*i.e.* of God in our consciousness and our will, in our knowledge and our life) is followed by certain effects in us which are not the less judicial and punitive because they are strictly natural and necessary. The punishment for sin is the habit of sin, the bondage to sin, and that death, spiritual, moral, and natural, which is the wages of sin simply because it is the recompense or return which it reaps from its own natural increase. Salvation is emancipation from all this: it is the breaking off from us of the false nature or condition of nature thus formed, and our restoration to the freedom of holiness, righteousness, and life. This is what Jesus Christ accomplished: in our nature, the nature of the first Adam from which every man needs redemption, He burst its bonds and set us free. He destroyed in it that which needs to be destroyed, and restores in it that which needs to be restored. He brought down the flesh and raised and restored the spirit to its lost ascendancy. In a word, Jesus Christ was in Himself human Salvation: He was and did precisely and perfectly what in any and every man is necessary to constitute his Salvation. He was the death of all man's evil, and the resurrection of all his good. What confuses our conception of the person and work of our Lord is the difficulty, and yet the necessity, of recognizing in Him both God and man in the process of human Salvation. He is both God *salvum faciens* and man

salvus factus, both the Logos by the Holy Ghost *saving* and man by the Word through the Spirit *saved*. Just as I have before shown that He is both the Logos incarnating Himself in the man Christ Jesus, and the man Christ Jesus freely and personally and humanly incarnating in Himself the Divine Logos.

So in the crucifixion and self-crucifixion of Jesus Christ the old man or flesh of sin, the false nature entailed upon humanity by and in Adam, was broken and destroyed, crucified, dead, and buried; and humanity arose out of its long bondage to sin and death. As St. Paul represents it, when we were dead in Adam, *i.e.* dead πνεύματι and alive σαρκὶ, God quickened and raised us up in Christ, in whom we are dead σαρκὶ and made alive πνεύματι — crucified in the flesh and made alive in the spirit. What was the meaning and the effect of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ he tells us precisely in these words (Eph. 4:20, etc.): "But ye did not so learn Christ, if indeed ye heard Him and were taught in Him, as truth is [or as is true] in Jesus." The Apostle is endeavoring to turn those to whom he is writing from the vanity, darkness, and uncleanness of their natural minds and life to the life indeed which is *realized* for us in Jesus. And what is this truth of life, or this true life, which has been objectively actualized for us as it is to be subjectively actualized in us in Jesus Christ? That which is true in Jesus he goes on to define as "the putting off our old man of the corrupt and deceitful σάρξ, and the being renewed in the spirit of our mind and putting on the new man which has been created after God in righteousness

and holiness." Has been *created* — when and how? In Jesus Christ, who is the new creation, and in whom we have all been potentially and shall by grace through faith be actually new created. In Him "the old things" (the old man and all that belongs to him) have passed or been taken away; and new things (the new man with what pertains to him) have *become* or come to pass (2 Cor. 5:17). He is in Himself that which we are to become — which already in grace and in anticipating faith, though not yet in accomplished fact, we *have* become — in Him. So again (in Col. 3:9, etc.) we are said to have "put off the old man with his doings, and put on the new man who is being renewed in us unto knowledge after the image of Him who created him." In such passages Jesus Christ is both new creator and new creation, God creating and man created, God in us and we in God.

With regard to the above interpretation of ἀλήθεια (in Eph. 4:21), we have a parallel in 1 John 2:8, where "the old commandment" of love is represented as become "new" in Jesus Christ and in us in Him. "Again I write unto you a new commandment, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν." As in Adam the divine law and life of love was lost in humanity, so in Christ it is restored, it becomes again ἀληθές, a living and operative reality and fact in Him and in us. So here (Eph. 4:21) what is ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, what is realized or become fact in Him for all humanity, is the putting off forever of the old man or nature of sin, and the putting on of the new man of the supremacy of the spirit over the flesh.

Again (Col. 2:10) we are said to have been "*in Him* circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein we were raised also with Him, through faith in the operation of God who raised Him from the dead." That is, we have in Christ put off the flesh of sin, and we are in Christ raised from the death of the flesh into the life of the spirit, provided that we through faith are in that ἐνέργεια Θεοῦ, that gracious working in us of God, wherein and whereby *He* died in the flesh and arose in the spirit. The meaning of circumcision and baptism in their application to our Lord Himself I hope later to discuss more fully. But why are we so everywhere represented as having been circumcised in *Christ's* circumcision, and baptized with *His* baptism, and dead in *His* death, and raised by *His* resurrection, if *He* did not as man, in our nature, perform some act and accomplish some change in which was fulfilled all that is meant by circumcision and baptism and death and resurrection? In other words, if He was not the true putting off of all the sin of the flesh, because of the whole flesh of sin; if He was not the excision of all that false nature or false condition of our nature which was our inheritance of the natural consequences of Adam's, or the race's sin; if in Him our humanity did not actually die in all in which it needed to die in itself in order to live in God!

CHAPTER SEVENTEENTH.

OF THE HUMAN NATURE OF JESUS CHRIST. — *Continued.*

But now let us come to those passages which bring us most directly to the point, and place us face to face with the fact we are discussing; passages which, as I think, distinctly affirm the position herein taken. And I first ask careful attention to the opening verses of the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

To the close of chapter seventh St. Paul has been describing the hopelessness of our bondage to sin and death so long as we are *in the flesh;* our *ἀσθένεια* or incapacity for holiness, righteousness, and life without *a redemption* from the inherited weakness of the flesh (the flesh in this whole connection being human nature in its actual condition of disadvantage from the fact of the Fall). The seventh chapter ends with the cry of the human spirit for redemption from the bondage in the flesh, and with an outburst of joy and thanks that this redemption has been accomplished in Jesus Christ our Lord. And the eighth chapter then goes on to define and develop the truth or fact of our redemption.

"There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," means when sifted to the bottom that we are no longer (in Christ) subject to *any* of those consequences of sin in our flesh which constitute the divine condemnation of sin. But we are free in Christ from all the penal consequences of sin because we are freed in Him from sin itself. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, *because* the law of the spirit of life has in Christ Jesus set us free from the law of sin and death." "Hath set *me* free," the Apostle says; the emancipation of the *person* from the bondage of *the nature*, of the spirit from the flesh. "For," he continues, "whereas *the law* had been impotent to fulfil itself in us, not through its own weakness but through *our* weakness in the flesh to obey it, God having sent His own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit." Here Christ is represented as, in the likeness of the flesh of sin, having accomplished an act in the flesh, the effect of which is that we are no longer subject to sin but are free to follow the spirit, fulfil the law, and live the life of holiness and righteousness. What was this act? Was it not an actual putting away from the nature He had assumed of all those natural consequences which it had inherited from the sin and transgression of the race, and which stood between us and our holiness, righteousness, and life in God — a putting away first in Himself and then in us? For observe that every-

where *our* ability to be saved, *i.e.* to die in the flesh and live in the spirit, is conditioned upon our faith in the *ἐνέργεια Θεοῦ* which wrought in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The exceeding greatness of the power of God working in us through our faith is *identical* with the working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead (Eph. 1:19, 20). Which must mean at the very least *this:* that the divine operation or inworking of God by which humanity is raised up through the death in it of what needs to be put to death, and the life in it of that which needs to be made alive, was in some way *first* enacted in Jesus Christ Himself, and is *now* enacted in us through our faith in the *ἐνέργεια*, or enacting, of it in Him. That is, that we see in Him first the self-same inworking of God and raising from the dead which in us, through our faith in the operation of it in Him, will constitute our Salvation.

But let us consider in detail Rom. 8:3, etc. "God having sent His own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin" (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*). But for the notion that these words if taken in what, if there were no such doctrinal or practical difficulty, *would be* their palpable meaning, would compromise the Church's doctrine of the human sinlessness and the deity of our Lord, I do not think it would have been thought possible to interpret them otherwise than that He assumed the *σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας*. When, for example (Phil. 2:6, etc.), He is said to have, in His *κένωσις*, laid aside the form of God and taken that of a servant, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*, com-

ing in the likeness of men, "the likeness of men" can mean nothing less than the very reality of manhood. When He is said (Heb. 2:17) in all respects to have been made like unto (*ὁμοιωθῆναι*) His brethren, we do not interpret the likeness to be anything less than an identity of nature. When He is said (Heb. 4:15) to have shared our weaknesses and been tempted *κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα*, in all respects after the likeness of our temptation, sin only excepted (*i.e.* with the sole exception "that *He* did not commit sin" — Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament*), we are expressly forbidden to make any other qualification of His essential oneness with us in our nature and our temptations than the one of His having overcome our temptations, and so been sinless in our nature.

In a word, it is not too much to say, that if the words *ἐν ὁμοιώματι* are interpreted consistently, not only with the above passages, but with their use anywhere in the New Testament, St. Paul's language in Rom. 8:3 will affirm nothing less than this: that the nature which our Lord took in the womb of the Virgin was that selfsame nature which in all of us is subject, and the cause of our subjection, to sin; and which is, therefore, in the New Testament unhesitatingly called "the flesh of Sin," even when assumed by Him.

I do not assert that *ὅμοιος* and *ὁμοίωμα* are not capable of meaning mere semblance without identity. The words are used very much as we use *like* and *likeness*. But if I should say, "I am a man of *like* passions with you," no one would think of seeing in

the form of expression the suggestion of a *difference* as well as a resemblance between your and my passions. He would simply understand me to mean that they were *the same*. When it is said that the Son of God came in the *likeness* of man, was made *like* unto us, was tempted in all points *like* as we are, etc., we resent the thought that the word *like* was intended to suggest any difference. There *was* a difference, but that was otherwise expressed; and it was a difference not in the nature, but in His personal action in the nature. It consisted in the fact that He alone so overcame and destroyed the sin of the nature as to be sinless in it.

I repeat, then, that in the words, "God sent His Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin," it ought never to have occurred to any one to find, beside the statement of the resemblance, any suggestion of a difference. The true explanation of the use of ὁμοίωμα, in connection with our Lord's manhood, is to be found in the fact of His two natures or modes of personal subsistence. He who in eternity was God, in time became man, or came in the likeness of man. By which we do not mean that He was not *very* man, or intend by the use of the word *likeness* to suggest that there was any difference between His manhood and other men's, but only that He was more than very man, and that he had a personal existence *before* He came as man, or in the likeness of man.

God then "sent his Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin." Of any of us it would be equally true to predicate the flesh of sin and the sin of the

flesh. Of Him to predicate the sin of the flesh would be not only blasphemy against His deity, but the contradiction of the very meaning and end of His humanity. For if His whole personal human life was a condemnation, crucifixion, and destruction of sin in the flesh, how can that sin be predicated of Him? But in some sense it must have been in His flesh, for how otherwise could He have condemned, crucified, and destroyed it there? And that is just precisely what this passage affirms that He did. "God sending His Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin and for sin (*i.e.* "to break the power of sin" — Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament*, under *ἁμαρτία*) condemned sin in the flesh ("brake its power in human nature" — Thayer).

Then the Apostle does not hesitate here — nor elsewhere, as we shall see — to say that our Lord had something to crucify, and crucified something, not in Himself personally, but in His flesh or assumed nature. If any part of that which He crucified, or which was crucified in Him, was *of Himself*, *i.e.* was the effect of any sin or transgression on His part, then He was not the perfect conqueror and crucifier of the flesh of sin, but was in that respect, or to that extent, conquered by it. But if what He crucified was wholly not of *Him*, but the effect and consequence of Adam's or man's sin taken and borne by Him in order to be taken *away* by Him through His crucifixion and extinction of it, then I say that He was verily and indeed the condemner and destroyer of sin in the flesh in the only way in which He could in any real sense have been so. For how could He

have destroyed that in His flesh which was not there to destroy?

We might repeat the query through the whole round of expressions by which the New Testament describes our Lord's work of human Salvation. In what sense was He the *sanctifier*, ὁ ἁγιάζων, and not merely ὁ ἅγιος, not merely the holy *in*, but the maker-holy *of*, human nature? Is it not that He was only holy in it by making it holy in Himself; that He was holy not by the mere fact of a holy nature, but by an act of His own in it making it holy, *i.e.* by the act of a perfect personal holiness, righteousness, and life, or of a perfect faith, obedience, and self-activity in it? But if He was thus the *sanctifier*, then that which He assumed must have been *to be* sanctified; for otherwise He could not have sanctified it. Where is the difficulty of saying that He took humanity unholy, in order to make it holy? That He became the holiness, the righteousness, of our nature, by *Himself* being holy and righteous in our nature? In doing which He, by the very fact of His perfect holiness, condemned and destroyed sin in the flesh.

There is a figure running all through both Old and New Testaments which, more effectively and affectingly than any other possibly could, reveals in all its height and depth the inconceivable love and condescension of God in the Salvation of man — so inconceivable that for the most part we refuse to accept it in its full meaning and extent. The extremest application of the figure is found in Jer. 3:1: "They say, if a man put away his wife [for unfaith-

fulness and impurity on her part], and she go from him and become another man's, shall he return to her again? Shall not that land be greatly polluted? But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers, yet return again to me, *saith the Lord*." Let us not be jealous for the purity of God, or fear that it shall be defiled by any depths of love to which He will descend! Love is the only thing that cannot be defiled by what it touches, and though in the person of our Lord it has taken into union with itself our sin-stained and sin-staining nature, we may be sure that in cleansing from all, it will itself receive no, stain. The Divine Husband of humanity — defiled, unfaithful, adulterous, though she be — has said to her in the incarnating love of our Lord, Yet return unto Me! He has taken her to Himself, and saved her by His love. He has sanctified her and cleansed her, and presented her to Himself without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

I have here adapted to our Lord's natural body words spoken of His body mystical, the Church. But throughout the whole analogy and comparison between these, is it not implied that as He has taken one so has He taken the other, and that as He is sanctifier and Saviour of the one, so is He of the other? Why otherwise is the Church, the humanity of His larger incarnation, called His *body*, but that He has united it to Himself in order that in Him it might be sanctified and saved, *just as* He has destroyed sin and been the author of holiness in His natural body, the body of His lesser and more limited incarnation?

What has been said of Jesus Christ as sanctifier

is equally applicable to Him as redeemer. How was He the redemption and redeemer of the humanity He assumed except as in it He broke the bands that bound it? When St. Paul says that "the law of the spirit of life hath *in Christ Jesus set me free* from the law of sin and death," he speaks of a redemption which takes place *in me* in Christ only as it first took place in me *in Christ*. He was Himself the redemption which He is in me; that was enacted in His body natural which is daily being re-enacted in His body mystical and in the individual members of it. Jesus Christ was objectively and is subjectively our redemption, and our subjective or actual redemption consists in our being, in Him through faith, subjects of the self-same *ενέργεια*, or divine inworking, which wrought in Him to the breaking the bands of a sinful nature. And so we might go through the whole list of expressions by which human Salvation is defined, and prove that the whole of Salvation was accomplished by our Lord in the change wrought by Him in the human nature which He assumed, and which in His own human person He sanctified, redeemed, and saved. God in and through Him condemned and destroys sin in the flesh that we in and through Him might be made free from the power, condemnation, and death of sin in the flesh.

Rom. 8:3 suggests a kindred passage, 2 Cor. 5:21, "Him who knew no sin He made sin for us, that we may become the righteousness of God in Him." The *μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν*, *not knowing* sin, if meant to apply to our Lord's *divine* self-consciousness and personality, can only mean *incapable of knowing*

sin. If it is intended, as it must be, to describe Him in His human self-consciousness and personal life, it brings out more clearly than any other words could a truth which I have already endeavored to state.

But let us interpret the passage in *each* of these two senses. The word γινώσκειν has, in the New Testament, a peculiarly personal and subjective force. We only truly *know* that which enters into our own personality, or into which our own personality enters. If anything is outside of that we may know about it, but we do not essentially *know* it. Thus St. John knows nothing of any *knowing God* which is not essentially a being in God and God in us. To say that we know God, and to show by what we are and do that God is not in us — *i.e.* in our personal being and acting — is to him a self-contradiction. And, in the same sense of *knowing*, St. Paul (Rom. 7 : 15), speaking of the sin in his flesh as a bondage of *his nature* and something outside of his *self* or inmost *personality*, says : "For what I do *I know not*"; "It is not *I* that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me — that is, in my σάρξ, or nature." The sin under the bondage of which he felt himself, and of which he acknowledged himself guilty, was nevertheless something external to *himself*, and which, therefore, *he did not know*. One only knows what is of himself and part of his own conscious self-activity ; even what we *do*, if we do it under compulsion of causes or conditions outside of ourselves, we *know* not, for in reality *we* do it not. This applies, of course, only to those in whom the personal will is really opposed to the sin, which nevertheless it cannot conquer or destroy.

If it could, there would be no need of redemption. But no son of Adam will be finally condemned for being a sinner, but only for not being redeemed from sin. We shall be judged at the last day, not for being what Adam made us, but only for not being what Christ would make us. Interpreting, then, the "not knowing sin" of the pre-incarnate, divine, consciousness and personality of our Lord, we say that He who was, of course, incapable of knowing sin was in some sense *made sin* for us. Does this mean that He was sent in a body, or in a human flesh which was made to *represent* sin, and which was then treated and crucified *as though it were* the body or flesh of sin? Unless it means something more and more real than this, it *must* mean this. For is it not expressly said that His crucifixion was the crucifying of our old man and the destroying of the body of sin (Rom. 6:6); the crucifixion of the flesh with its affections and lusts (Gal. 5:24); the putting off of the old man with his doings (Col. 3:9)? And if it was not this in some real sense, then it was so in a representative or fictitious sense — *i.e.* our Lord's body, or flesh, is *called* and treated *as though* it were that which in all men needs to be condemned and destroyed. I prefer the real sense, according to which our Lord was made sin, in that He took upon Him the flesh of sin. He took our nature with all those consequences in it of the Fall, which make *us* sinners. *He* was sinless in it, not by the fact of *its* being sinless, but by the act of *His* condemning and destroying sin in it. By taking upon Him *our* sin and abolishing it, He became our righteousness, and enables us to become the righteousness of God in Him.

I believe, however, that the "not knowing sin" of the passage under consideration refers to the *human* consciousness and personality of our Lord. It is not the Divine Logos incapable of knowing sin, but the man Christ Jesus who, though in the flesh of sin, *knew* nothing of the sin of the flesh; *i.e.* who was *personally* sinless in a *nature*, in which all other men are sinful, and who thus destroyed sin in the nature. I cannot, therefore (with Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament* under *αμαρτιά*), interpret "made Him to be sin" to mean "treated Him, who knew not sin, as a sinner." God treats things as they are, and His treatment is only the natural consequence of what they are. If He treats us who are sinners as though in Christ we were *not* sinners, it is because in Christ we *are not* sinners. And it is only *as* we are not sinners in Christ that we shall be treated so; it is only as He has abolished our sin that He has abolished our condemnation. We are not under the condemnation of the flesh because in Christ we are not in the flesh, we are dead to it. If, then, God condemned, crucified, and destroyed anything in Jesus Christ, it is not that He made Him to *represent* that thing and then treated Him *as though* He were it, but that Jesus Christ took upon Him, in His human nature, that which needed to be, and which *was* in Him, condemned, crucified, and destroyed, viz. *our* sin. Only it was *He Himself*, His love, His holiness, His obedience unto death, who was its crucifixion and destruction.

The two passages already treated suggest yet a third of kindred tenor (Gal. 3:13): "Christ re-

deemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us." Every human being who is under the law is under a curse. The law is nothing but the expression of our own perfection and blessedness. What it requires of us is only that we shall be that and do that which constitutes, and which alone can constitute, our perfection and blessedness. But the law requires of us for these that which, in our flesh or in the present condition of our nature, it is impossible for us to render. And not to obey and fulfil the law is in itself imperfection and brings its own condemnation and curse. In the language of the New Testament the law cannot make holy; it can only convince and convict of sin and bring us under its condemnation and punishment, which is death. Let us see how this curse of the law works. We have seen before how, from our very nature as spiritual, and not only moral, beings (*i.e.* capable of obedience to the divine law only through and in union with the divine life), *law cannot justify us.* It makes no difference what meaning we give to *justify.* If it means only that obedience to law can never be for us a ground or procuring cause of the divine favor and acceptance, that can only be because it can never make us worthy or proper objects of the divine favor and acceptance. Whatever meaning we give to *justify*, it must come back in the end to mean *make righteous.* If we cannot be justified by obedience or works of the law, but only by faith of Jesus Christ, it can be at bottom only because we cannot by obedience or works become what God can recognize as righteous, and therefore what *is* righteous; and we

can become so through faith of Jesus Christ. We cannot obey unto righteousness, but we can believe unto righteousness; which means that we cannot become righteous of ourselves by our own obedience to the law of righteousness, but we can become righteous of God by reception through faith of the spirit of righteousness; *i.e.* the spirit of Jesus Christ the Righteous imparting to us the righteousness of Christ. Consequently, even if we were unfallen, *law* as such could not justify us. But St. Paul does not go back so far as this in his present argument. We are fallen, and the application to us of the divine, which is also our own, law can only have the effect of revealing to us the fact of our disobedience and the impossibility of our obedience to it. The ministration of the law, therefore, is simply the ministration to us of the knowledge of sin, judgment, and death.

In the flesh, consequently, and under the law, we are under a curse. The curse is not something external to us and arbitrary; it is inherent in and inseparable from the situation itself. Every man born of Adam inherits a nature in which he not only sins against God but sins against himself, and transgresses the law not only of God but of his own perfection and blessedness. To tell him so by revealing and applying to him the law of holiness, righteousness, and life does not help or save him. It only converts him from an unconscious into a conscious transgressor, and by so making his sin sinful plunges him into deeper depths of sin. The curse of such a situation is in itself; sin known becomes its own condemnation and punishment.

What is our Salvation from the fact of the flesh and the curse of the law? The Apostle in this epistle tells us that "God sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem us that are under the law." That is, Jesus Christ came in the flesh and under the law to set us free from the power of the flesh and the curse of the law. He came in the flesh, with no difference *in it* from us; only that whereas *we* obey, He *broke*, its power. But now let us see what was His relation to the law and its curse. When it is said that our Lord came under the law, it is meant that He came also under the curse of the law; and he was made a curse identically as we have seen that He was made sin for us. He was under the curse, not in the sense that the curse was arbitrarily or vicariously imposed upon Him, but simply *in that* and *because* He was in the flesh. Inasmuch as the nature in which He came was subject to all the *natural* consequences of the sin that had been committed in it, He in it was under the curse of it, for these inherited consequences constituted its curse. Thus He was not only subject to physical death, but spiritually and morally it was necessary for Him to inflict death upon *it*, in order not to be *Himself* subject to its death. That He was not subject to the sin and death of our flesh was solely in consequence of His crucifying the flesh of sin and death. That He was under the curse of our nature is evidenced by the fact of His having to *die to sin*, *i.e.* having to crucify, and be crucified in, that in Him which if it had not been crucified would have been sin in Him. "In that He died," says St. Paul,

"He died to sin" (Rom. 6:10); or "the death that He died was the death to sin" — that same death to sin which he goes on immediately (without any discrimination) to say that we must believe that we now share with Him: "Likewise reckon ye yourselves also to be dead unto sin and alive unto God." His death, as ours in Him, was the crucifixion of the flesh or nature of sin; and His life, as ours in Him, was the liberation and resurrection of the spiritual, or God-related, personality in us from the bondage and death of the flesh.

CHAPTER EIGHTEENTH.

OF THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT IN RELATION TO OUR LORD.

The conclusions so far reached may best, perhaps, be summed up and presented in the illustration used by St. Paul in Rom. 7 : 1–6, to which I now call attention. "Do ye not know, brethren, that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he *liveth?*" And then he proceeds to illustrate the point he wishes especially to make, viz. that if we are not now, as we *are* not, under the law, its requirements, condemnation, and penalties, it is because in Christ we no longer *live*, or are no longer *alive*. In Him we are dead *in that wherein* we were under the law. The man over whom the law exercises dominion is the *natural man*. Upon *him* it makes its claims; the obedience, the righteousness it exacts of him is *his* obedience and righteousness. If he fails to render this and satisfy its demands, he comes under its condemnation and incurs its penalties. As long as the natural man *lives*, it is impossible for him to evade the alternative of either perfectly (himself) fulfilling the law, or suffering all the consequences of its non-fulfilment. The law is the necessary and inevitable

law of the natural man: it is but the expression of what he must be, for life and blessedness. Disobedience to it cannot but be imperfection and death. The only defect or weakness of the law is not in itself, but in us: it lies in the fact that it makes its requirement of *us* who are unable to meet it, *i.e.* upon us in ourselves and our own natural powers of obedience and righteousness. As long as we continue for life and righteousness in ourselves, in our natural powers, *i.e. in the natural man*, we are and cannot but be under the law, either to render it a perfect obedience, or else to suffer all the necessary consequences of disobedience. The only way to escape the dominion of the law is to forsake the natural man, to escape from ourselves into God in Christ. Now Christ is Himself the death of the natural and the life of the spiritual man, the death of humanity in itself, and its life in God; and so in Christ we are dead in that wherein we were under the condemnation and death of the law, and alive in that wherein we are set free from these. The Apostle's illustration is as follows: "The woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So, then, if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress though she be joined to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to Him that was raised from the dead, that we might

bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions which were through the law wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we have been released from the law, having died in that (*i.e.* in that old, or natural man) wherein we were holden, or were subject to the law. So that we serve in newness of the spirit, and not in oldness of the letter." In this little parable, the *wife* is *we*, humanity or the individual human soul or personality, viewed as first in the old man, or natural man, or Adam, and secondly in Christ; these two being the two husbands. So long as we are in the natural man, we are under the law of the natural man. And the law of the natural man, as we have seen, is the law of *natural* obedience, of *our own* righteousness. But our natural manhood is that of Adam, of a fallen nature, of the flesh. And *in it* we are incapable of obedience or righteousness. The law which requires of us perfection cannot *make* us perfect, but only reveals our imperfection. Ordained for righteousness, it only aggravates our unrighteousness; for life, it produces death. As long as we are *in the flesh*, the sinful passions, which, so far from being suppressed, are only excited and strengthened by the law, work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. The only way in which we can be no longer *under the law* is to be no longer *in the flesh;* so long as we are in it, the law will work in us only sin and death. Not until we are dead in the flesh shall we be alive from the law. But how can we be dead in the flesh, and so to the law? If we would but know and receive and realize it, not

only in thought but in faith, we *are* dead in the flesh and to the law. "Brethren, ye *were* made dead to the law διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, by or through the body of Christ." "I by the law died to the law, that I may live to God. I was crucified with Christ; and *I* live no longer; *Christ* lives in me" (Gal. 2:19, 20). Jesus Christ has, both in Himself and in us, both in His natural and in His mystical body, crucified the flesh. This, in the absolute terms in which it is expressed, is true for us, of course, only in the Word of God, and in our faith. It is true *in us* in fact, only in so far as we have as yet realized or actualized it in ourselves; and this, according to the mind of the Scriptures and in the experience of the Church, is a process necessarily gradual, and never completed in this life. But what is not yet true in fact *is* already true in *faith;* so that the same Apostle who said, in the language of one, "Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect; but I press on, that I *may* apprehend that for which I was also apprehended by Christ Jesus," could also say, in the language of the other, "We are *complete* in Him"; and could represent us as not only dead and buried with Christ, but risen, ascended, and seated at God's right hand in Him, and there already blessed with *all* spiritual blessings.

In Christ Jesus, therefore, we are dead in the old man, or first husband, and no longer under his law, and we are married to and live in the new man, or second husband. But to bring out the full meaning of the illustration and apply it to what has gone before, it is necessary to develop anew two thoughts.

First, What is called in the New Testament not only the death, but the violent death, the crucifixion, of the *old man* is a very essential principle and element not only in all true religion, but in all real and effectual ethics. One of the notes of Messiah in the Old Testament is that "He will carry out right to truth," *i.e.* He will carry out righteousness and judgment, *εἰς ἀλήθειαν*, to the fullest realization or actuality (Is. 42:3), or as St. Matthew quotes it (12:20), *εἰς νῖκος*, to victory. He will *establish right* upon earth (Is. 42:4). But *all εἰς ἀλήθειαν* is *εἰς νῖκος*; all triumph and realization of right is victory over something resistant and hostile, and that *in ourselves*. I have stated how Kant makes virtue to consist in the victory of reason over sensibility or natural inclination; and recognizes such an abnormal force of this latter in us that he calls it "radical evil," a term quite as strong as "original sin." And how Bishop Butler says that even prior to or outside of the fact of "the Fall," there is in the very nature of propension or particular affection that which reason and free will have to *overcome* in order to virtue: but then fully recognizes how much this is strengthened and confirmed by the accumulated, consolidated, and transmitted effects of that transgression of the race which we call the Fall. So there *is* an old man in whom we are, a husband to whom we are bound, by nature. And this old man with whom, in Adam, I am indissolubly bound up is both *I* and *not* I. If he were *I*, how could I desire to be, and *be*, released and separated from him by his death? On the other hand, he is so *I* that all denial of him is unquestionably for

me *self*-denial, and his crucifixion is a self-crucifixion. "I am crucified with Christ," in whom my old man is crucified; *therefore* the old man was I. "Nevertheless I live"; *therefore* the old man was not I. The paradox is, of course, easily enough understood and needs no explanation. But what needs to be brought out is that all virtue and righteousness, as well as all holiness or life of God in us, requires a separation or divorce by death from that in us which is so little ourselves that we can only become ourselves by separation from it, and yet is so much ourselves that its death is ours also. Well does St. Paul say that the wife is "done away" or "abolished" from the first husband and his law (*κατήργηται*), and that we *κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα*, were done away by death from the old man and his law.

But the old man is the natural man as natural and not merely as sinful, in his righteousness as well as in his unrighteousness; *i.e.* in the impotency of his righteousness as well as in the evil of his unrighteousness; in his *dead* as well as in his wicked works. So long as the battle of righteousness is fought out on the line of one's own, or *natural*, righteousness, it must be fought under the law, and be judged by the law, and abide by the sentence and awards of the law. If our righteousness is to be *our* righteousness, the righteousness of the natural man or first husband, it can be none other than that which the law prescribes; and it must be *attained* by us for life and blessedness, or by its non-attainment life and blessedness must be forfeited.

The alternative, that righteousness is not to be

earned through obedience, but received through faith; that it is not wrought *by* the natural man, but wrought *in* the spiritual man; that it is not from us to God, but from God in us; and that it is not until we have realized the impotency and failure, have felt the sin and guilt, and have suffered the death of the old or natural man that we can live the life and work the works of the new or spiritual man — all this is, as our Lord Himself says, not a destroying the law, but a fulfilling it. It is, as the passage we are studying concludes, a substitution of the service of the spirit for that of the letter, — the replacing the demand for an impossible obedience by the gift of one made divinely possible and actual in us by the spirit of God.

But the *second* point in St. Paul's illustration, and in his teaching generally, which I have alluded to as bearing directly upon our argument is this: that Jesus Christ is just as much represented as having accomplished the death of our flesh as He was by His resurrection the life of our spirit. He just as much crucified, in the *nature* He assumed, our old man as by His *personal* human faith and life in the nature He quickened and raised our new man. "We were made dead [in the old man, and so] to the law *through the body of Christ*." Our old man was crucified *in Him*. Of course, in so far as what we understand by the old man is the result of sins which we have ourselves, *i.e.* personally, committed, there could have been no such thing in Jesus Christ. But in so far as it is something in the nature and not of ourselves, something from which we need to be

redeemed in order to be ourselves, the whole language of the epistles in asserting that He was its ἀποθέσθαι and ἀθέτησις — its putting off and annulling — assumes that He had first taken it upon Himself with His flesh. We say that our Lord, inasmuch as He was the death of the flesh, Himself died in it and to it. The difference between us and Him is this: *We*, who not only inherited the flesh of sin, but have been guilty of the sin of the flesh, nevertheless being, through Him, dead in that flesh in which we sinned, are now dead from the sin and from all its guilt and consequences. He who is dead is free from sin, not only in the real sense of St. Peter (1 Pet. 4:1), "He that hath suffered [*i.e.* died] in the flesh hath *ceased* from sin," but in the judicial as well as real sense of St. Paul (Rom. 6:7), "He that hath died is justified from sin" (*i.e.* pronounced righteous because made righteous from sin). The fact of our freedom from all power, guilt, and death of sin is due to the fact that in Jesus Christ we are dead in the flesh, and so dead to the law and its claims, judgment, and sentence. *Christ*, on the other hand, who inherited the flesh of sin but was Himself sinless in it, in no sense of course died to His own sin, because He had none to die to; but He did die to sin in that His very sinlessness in the flesh was the death of that flesh of sin which, if He had not died in it and to it, *would have been* sin in Him. As I have frequently said, our Lord's sinlessness in the flesh was not the sinlessness of His flesh, but His own sinlessness in the flesh. It was His crucifixion of sin in His flesh *before it became sin*. The

sin which He crucified was not His own but ours, and it was not, it did not become, His own because He condemned and destroyed it by His sinlessness. He did no sin because He crucified in Himself that, the not crucifying of which in us is sin.

The death of the flesh to the spirit in Christ is as really our resurrection from the dead as the death of the spirit to the flesh in Adam was and is our fall. But in a different way; we are related to Adam by natural fact, we are related to Christ by spiritual act. The fall of Adam, coming *through the nature*, extends to all; the resurrection of Christ, coming by the divine Word addressed to, and the divine Spirit operating in, the *personal* consciousness, free will, and self-activity, extends only to those who believe. But still the resurrection of Jesus Christ is just as much that of every man and all men *who believe* as Adam's fall was that of all men who are naturally born of him. "*We* died [in the flesh, and so] to the law, *by the body of Jesus Christ*." In all who are in Christ Jesus by a real and living baptism the same ἐνέργεια Θεοῦ works which wrought in Him, and to the same result — the death of the old man in them and the resurrection and life of the new.

The Christian consciousness might be expressed as follows in the matter we have been discussing. The question with every man is whether he shall dominate or be dominated by his nature or flesh. So far as *we* are able to determine the issue, it is already decided against us. The flesh is dominant, and we are helpless in any real sense or degree to recover the supremacy which we ought to exercise over it. To do

that would require not merely that we shall, in an unfallen and unimpaired nature, acquire a habit and character of faith, obedience, and life, but that we shall rid ourselves of, separate from ourselves and put off a fallen nature, *i.e.* a false nature of unbelief, disobedience, and death which has been organizing and consolidating itself in the whole history of the race of which we are members, and has come down to us through a thousand generations. But all that Salvation would be in us has been enacted for us in Christ. In Him *God is become our Salvation* and reveals the divine *ἐνέργεια*, or inworking, which is needed and is able to save us. In Christ, and in us in Christ by grace through faith, the inherited nature of sin, the *σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας*, is condemned and destroyed, and we are raised up in the spirit, or in the activity of a personal life made alive in God and enabled to fulfil its law, and so to freely and perfectly realize itself. In Christ, therefore, we are crucified, dead, and buried in the flesh and risen and alive in the spirit. In the life of the spirit we are no longer under the disabilities and curse of the law. Jesus Christ through faith and by grace, and no longer the law through our own impossible obedience to it, is our righteousness. Not that we are not *to be* righteous — nothing can absolve us from that, for righteousness is our only life and blessedness. It is a question not of *whether* we shall be, but only of *how* we shall be righteous, — whether by *our being*, or God in Christ *making us* so through our faith. And it was only as our Lord was made a curse for us that He became our righteousness. It was only

as He took our flesh of sin and nailed it to His cross, that He abolished sin in the flesh and made us free from sin.

There has been much effort expended upon the vain attempt to explain upon any other ground than the above our Lord's own comparison of His crucifixion to the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness (St. John 3 : 14). The serpent crawling upon his belly and eating dust is the symbol of the life of sense, the merely natural as opposed to the higher spiritual. The lifting up of the serpent is the exact figurative expression for the crucifixion of the sensuous nature or flesh by the victorious activity and life of the spirit. So "Christ was once offered *εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας* (Heb. 9 : 28) to lift up and nail to His cross the sins of many," *i.e.* to crucify for all men that flesh which is the seat and source of all their sins, and in the death of which their sins are dead.

I am fully aware not only of the certainty of being misunderstood, but also of the danger of grievous error in venturing to describe thus the flesh of our Lord. And, consequently, while I am confident of being in the mind of the New Testament, I am conscious also of a desire to repeat, perhaps, too much, explanations which may guard against error and misconception. The delicacy and vital importance of the subject will be, I hope, sufficient excuse for this. The so-called *sin* of our common nature or flesh, the flesh which our Lord Himself assumed, consists wholly in its determining *us* to sin. We can *not* sin only by resisting, denying, and crucifying it; and we

are unable to do this to the extent of not sinning, or being sinless. If, however, we could and should so resist, deny, and crucify it as by our personal act and life to not obey, but subdue and destroy, sin in our flesh, so far from sin only a higher sinlessness and holiness could be predicated of us. In fact so high a sinlessness as would be impossible for human nature, and as would testify more strongly than anything else could to the presence and power of God in it. That our Lord should have accomplished in our flesh this natural impossibility, that He should have been sinless not merely in a sinless but in a sinful nature, so far from compromising Him and His work, seems to me immeasurably to elevate both. But, moreover, let us never forget that the application of the term *sin* to our Lord's nature, or to any nature as such, is an improper and merely popular use of the term. In reply to the question whether our Lord in His human birth took *original sin*, my answer would be that He took all of original sin except the sin, except that which makes it properly and really *sin*, viz. that it should have caused Him to sin, which it did not. That which destroys *us* in our nature, *He* destroyed in our nature; that which is sin and death in us, because by reason of it we sin and die, was not so in Him who was the destroyer in Himself of sin and death. But there was no difference in His nature and ours save what *He* made in it. He was made like unto us in all respects, and was in all points tempted like as we are *only* with a different *result*. He was different from us not in having a different nature or flesh but only in that He by His

crucifixion of the flesh, by His victorious sinlessness in and over the flesh, condemned and destroyed sin in the flesh.

Since the defence of the view of Salvation here advocated has been so far drawn only from St. Paul, it may be well to see how far it is in harmony with the thought underlying the other epistles of the New Testament. Let us, then, consider a few passages selected from other writers.

1 *Pet.* 2 : 24. "Who His own self bare our sins in His body on the tree [or carried up our sins in His body to the tree], that we having died unto sins might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." In the body which our Lord took and which He lifted up and nailed to the tree, He crucified that flesh of sin in which all sin is crucified, in order that we (in Him) having died to sins may live to righteousness. So by His stripes we are healed; by His crucifixion of our flesh we are dead *in* and dead *from* the flesh and made alive in the spirit. The whole point of view is identical with that of Rom. 6, where Christ is represented as having crucified our old man and abolished the whole body of sin, that we might no longer serve sin, because he who has died in that which is sinful, or in which he was sinful, is free from sin.

1 *Pet.* 3 : 18. "Christ suffered once for sin, the just for the unjust, in order to bring us to God, *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δε πνεύματι*, being put to death in the flesh but quickened in the spirit." His bringing us to God, *i.e.* into oneness with God, consisted in His destroying the separation between

us and God. This He accomplished by His death in the flesh and life in the spirit. "The righteous for the unrighteous": That *He* was righteous does not mean that there was nothing wrong in the *nature* He took. If there was not, why did His righteousness involve and consist in His crucifixion of it? The interpretation of this passage receives light from and throws light upon one which follows in the same context (1 *Pet.* 4:1, 2), "Christ therefore having suffered in the flesh, do ye arm yourselves with the same mind; because he who has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin, that we should no longer live to the lusts of men but to the will of God." To suffer, or die, in the flesh is to cease from sin, because it is to be dead in that in which we were sinners. We must be conformed to Christ in His death in the flesh and to sin. Now of course Christ cannot be said by His death in the flesh and to sin to have ceased from sin in the sense of His having previously sinned. But may it not be said that He ceased from sin before it became and without its becoming sin in Him? He crucified it in the flesh before and without its extending to Himself and becoming His own. It was the one instance in humanity of a perfect *obstare principiis:* so resisting and excluding the principles and beginnings of sin, so crushing it in its bud in the flesh, as to, so to speak, destroy it before it existed.

We shall see how this explains certain bold expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews. For example, it is distinctly said in Heb. 7:27 that our Lord, in His function as High Priest, "by His offering of Him-

self, offered first for His own sins and then for the sins of the people." This will be explained more fully under the discussion of the sin offering. But I will say here that the *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, the truth underlying the sin offering, means the necessity of dying in the flesh as the only condition of not sinning. And our Lord Himself as man was not free from this necessity. For Him as for us sinlessness was to be attained only through that crucifixion of the flesh which is a dying to sin. He had to die for and to His own, *not indeed actual*, sins, — for that would imply that He had sinned, and, therefore, that He was not the perfect sin offering or death for and to sin, — but for and to the sins *potential* in His flesh or human nature, and which only did not become actual in Him through His crucifixion of them in His flesh.

Again (Heb. 9:28), "Christ having been once offered to bear the sins of many [*i.e.* (*ἀνενεγκεῖν*) to lift them up and nail them to His cross] will appear a second time *without sin* to those who look for Him for salvation." When he was seen by them the first time it was *with sin*, for it was in the act of crucifying it in His own body, in His human flesh. Not *His* sin, for He crucified it, and was, therefore, Himself sinless in His flesh, but the sin of the flesh which He crucified; for why otherwise did He crucify it? When He appears again, it will be without the flesh of sin which He took to destroy, and as the quickened and risen spiritual man in whom is no sin, because no nature or place of sin.

In the First Epistle of St. John the subject is rather *regeneration* than death and resurrection.

I am here tempted to give, at least an application, if not an explanation, of that passage in the Old Testament (Gen. 3:16) where the curse is laid upon Eve: "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." The physical fact almost seems to have been instituted to express a spiritual truth; not merely generation in general to be the symbol of regeneration, but generation since the Fall through deathly pangs and travail to express the fact that, now, only through death can the spiritual birth take place into the new life of regeneration. If we were not fallen how normally and blissfully would the natural man be born by grace through faith into the spiritual man! How, without undoing or unbecoming, would the man in Adam or nature become, through spiritual knowledge and free-will, by the appropriation of faith and the self-conformity of obedience, the man in Christ and in God! But now in sorrow only can we conceive the truth and bring forth the life. It is only through the pangs and death throes of the flesh that the spirit can be born in us.

St. John does not dwell upon all this. He is dealing with the great fact of *the life* and of the necessity of our being in it, without direct thought at the moment of the death through which, in us as in our Lord, it is born. But when he says that if we are walking *in the light*, — of truth, of holiness, of love, and joy, and peace, — *then* only and *thereby* we know that we are born anew into the life of God in Christ, and that the blood of Christ is cleansing us from all sin, this practical allusion to the actual cleansing power and effect of Christ's blood shows that the truth is

only in the background and not wholly absent. The truth, namely, that it is only in the death of Christ and in our own actual death in Christ that we are released from that flesh which is the source of all our darkness and sin and misery, and made alive in that spirit in which alone we have light and life. And so with him the ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας is a real putting away of sin, and not only (although it includes) a present pardon and peace. And with him, too, καθαρισμός and ἱλασμός are not mere imputative or judicial acts, but effectual acts of a *real* cleansing and a real reconciling with God through the putting away from us in Christ of all that separates from God.

But let us dwell a little more fully upon one passage in this epistle (ch. 3 : 5, 6). "And ye know that He was manifested to take away sin, and in Him is no sin. Every one who abideth in Him sinneth not. No one that sinneth hath seen Him or known Him." In St. John's Gospel 1 : 29, we are told that John the Baptist looking upon Jesus, Whom he had recently baptized, exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament* (under αἴρω) interprets αἴρειν ἁμαρτίαν in *this* passage, "to remove the guilt and punishment of sin by expiation, or to cause that sin be neither imputed nor punished." There is no context *here* to contradict this interpretation, and so it is possible to give it. But in 1 John 3 : 5, 6, quoted above, there *is* a context which renders that explanation impossible, and so the same *Lexicon* is compelled to give a very different meaning to identically the same words. *There* it makes τὰς ἁμαρ-

τίας αἴρειν to mean, "to cause sin *actually to cease*, so that in Christ who is free from sin we no longer sin." I interpret the passage thus: 1st, "He was manifested to take away sins." The end and result of our Lord's Incarnation was, in our flesh, to be the destroyer, by His own holiness and life, of sin and death. 2d, "And in Him was no sin." Why? Because by His crucifixion of the flesh of sin He destroyed sin in His flesh. 3d, "Every one that abideth in Him sinneth not." And why not? Because to be truly in Him is to be so in His death of the flesh that our flesh is dead in Him, and so in His life of the spirit that we are spiritually alive in Him. 4th, and finally, "No one who sinneth hath seen Him or known Him." Truly by faith to see Him and truly by experience to know Him is necessarily to be just what He is, to cease from sin and be holy. In proportion as we see and know Him as He is, we are made like Him. *So* Christ takes away sin.

CHAPTER NINETEENTH.

OF THE WORK OF JESUS CHRIST UPON EARTH.

Our Lord speaks frequently of the ἔργον, or *work*, which His Father had given Him to do. It is His meat and drink to do it, and at the close of His life He is conscious that He has accomplished it. What was that work?

We might bring the question before us in this way. All men who have been great actors in the world, and have left their impress upon it, have in one way or another accomplished some great thing. The assertion will scarcely, from any point of view, be questioned that Jesus Christ has made a greater and more permanent impression upon the world than any man who has lived in it. What did He *do* to produce so deep and abiding an impress? We might say that He *arose from the dead*, and that *that* accounts for the effect produced by Him: it was the resurrection that created the Church and Christianity. That is, or is not, a sufficient account of the matter of our inquiry according to what and how much we mean by it. If we mean simply the fact of a physical resurrection — which, of course, no one *can* mean — it is wholly insufficient. Even if Jesus Christ

did physically arise from the dead, *taken by itself* it would have been a barren and dead fact in the history of the world. But if by our Lord's resurrection from the dead we mean all that it really does mean, all the spiritual and moral invisible truth that lies behind the visible fact, then it is sufficient to account for everything that has, and for a great deal more that ought to have, resulted from it. In saying that He arose from the dead, we say much that does not appear in the letter of the words, as it did not appear on the surface of the fact. To some minds it is a sufficient explanation of our Lord's resurrection to say that He was God. That is reason enough; *of course* He could not be holden of death. But our Lord's resurrection was essentially a *human* fact and a human *act*. The reasons for it lie back in the human activities and life of Jesus, and not merely in His deity. The scriptural account of it is this: The physical resurrection is merely the outer and visible side of a great spiritual and moral act on our Lord's part. He was the conqueror of death only because He was the conqueror of sin. All His life through He was accomplishing something greater than raising His body from the grave. From beginning to end He was the spiritual and moral resurrector and resurrection of the human nature in which He lived. I do not say of the fallen nature in which He lived, for He could not be said to live in a fallen nature who was its perpetual resurrection. But He could only be the resurrection of it as *in itself* it needed to be raised; and by being as much the death of that in it which needed to die as the life of that which needed

to be made alive. That He by a not merely physical but spiritual and moral act arose ἐκ νεκρῶν, implies that He had been in some real sense ἐν νεκροῖς. So far as His nature as man, His *flesh*, was concerned, He *was* among the dead and arose *from* the dead. That He did not succumb to the physical death of the flesh was because He had overcome the spiritual and moral *cause* of death in the flesh, viz. *sin*. That He, and He alone among men, conquered both the sin and the death of the flesh, we can, of course, only account for by saying that He was not a *mere* man, but the Logos become man. But if He was the Logos become man, the evidence of it, the grounds of our believing Him to be such, is that He was a man embodying to us the Logos; *i.e.* the divine eternal thought, will, and purpose of humanity. *Because* as man in the flesh of our sin and death He conquered and destroyed sin and death, and was the sanctification, redemption, and resurrection of humanity, we say that He was not mere man, but God in humanity reconciling it unto Himself.

The work of Jesus Christ was thus simply in our human nature to *be* our human holiness, righteousness, and life; which involved His being our sanctification, our redemption, and our resurrection. In the perfection of His own human faith, obedience, and life His work on earth was accomplished. His ministry in heaven is to baptize us with the spirit, to communicate to us the power, to take us into, and sustain us in, the communion, of His own risen life; to impart to us the virtue of His own death and resurrection. With our Lord the rising of the physical

body is but a secondary incident and consequence of a previous spiritual act or fact, just as it is said of *us*, that if our spirit be life because of righteousness, then shall also our mortal body be quickened by the spirit that dwelleth in us (Rom. 8 : 10, etc.).

Every other great man whom the world has known was necessarily separated, by the pre-eminence and peculiarity of his greatness, from other men, and made to stand alone. There can be, at the same time, but one Alexander who conquers the world. If there were two, neither would be conqueror of the world. The work of Jesus Christ is the only one which, so far from being exclusive, is inclusive of all men's work. In Him we are potentially, and may be actually, *all*, in the truest and most real sense, conquerors of the world.

Aristotle asks: Has everything that exists its ἔργον, or function in the world; has each part or organ of man its function — the eye to see, the mind to understand, etc.; and has man as a whole, man as man, no specific ἔργον, or function? What, then, is the proper work of man as man, and consequently of every man? Is it not simply *to be a man; i.e.* to bring into ἐνέργεια, or actuality, every δύναμις, or potentiality, of his manhood? Is it not to fulfil one's self, not only as a product and part of nature, but as a spiritual and moral personality in the world; to know, to do, and to be what, through our intelligence, our free-will, and our self-activity, will make us that for which we are predestined, viz. our completed and perfected selves?

The ἔργον of Jesus Christ is thus simply that of

man, and of every man. He is *the man*, He in whom manhood has fulfilled itself. And since man is man only in relation, and is perfect man only in the perfection of his relation to all the beings to whom his nature relates him, Jesus Christ is the perfect man through the perfection in Him of all these relations. He is man in perfected relation with God, with men, with things, and with himself. Through the perfection of his human *faith*, or divine relationship, He is the perfect spiritual man, the man in whom God wholly is, and who therefore is wholly in God. Through the perfection of His human *obedience*, or conduct or character, He is the perfect moral man, the man in whom the law of God is wholly fulfilled, and the law of man fully realized. Through that necessary relation between a man's personality and his nature which makes the physical always eventually what the spiritual in him is, He is the perfect natural man, the man who has attained the highest self-realization and blessedness. Alexander the Great can be a study or model only for conquerors, Socrates only for philosophers; but Jesus Christ is to every human being, of every kind or degree, a study and a model of and for *himself*. He is for every man the τί ἦν εἶναι ἀνθρώπου, *what it were to be a man*. What He was as man is the end of every human life; to have faith, to do righteousness, to live as man the life of God, sums it all up. How simple, how little it is, yet how much, how *all!* Put away your sin, cease to do wrong, arise from the dead. So universal and therefore so common an ἔργον as this has nothing of the *éclat*, the observation, the visible glory of the

career of the so-called world's conquerors. But in reality is not Jesus Christ the *only* real conqueror and world's conqueror? The Old-Testament Messiah was to be the Saviour of his people by being the conqueror of their enemies. In the universality and absoluteness of this conception, Jesus Christ is the Saviour of humanity by being the conqueror of its enemies. But what are the enemies of humanity, and what is it to be their conqueror? Its only real enemies are sin, transgression, and death; and its only possible conquests of these are holiness, righteousness, and life. The man who conquers these is the only true conqueror, and the man who has wholly conquered them has conquered the world.

Bishop Butler has shown conclusively how it is the nature, the actual tendency, and the destiny of virtue or righteousness to prevail over its opposite, and to possess the earth. The Scriptures are one long prophecy of the final victory and everlasting reign of righteousness. Jesus Christ the Righteous is the heir of the future, the possessor of the world to come, the κληρονόμος πάντων. Of the enemies of His kingdom, the first is sin and the last is death. But they all have been, and they all shall be, put under His feet, and through Him God shall reign and man shall be saved.

But let us come down more definitely and in detail to the investigation and analysis of the specific work of Christ on earth. We say in the Litany: By the mystery of Thy holy Incarnation; by Thy holy Nativity and Circumcision; by Thy Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation; by Thine Agony and Bloody Sweat;

by Thy Cross and Passion; by Thy precious Death and Burial; by Thy glorious Resurrection and Ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost — Good Lord, deliver us. And we are thoroughly scriptural in this selection and enumeration in their order of the elements and acts in our Lord's life which entered into and constituted the work of human redemption and Salvation. Now every one of these has direct reference to Himself and to His own human character and life. Take the three symbols of circumcision, baptism, and crucifixion, as applied to Him. These all mean identically one and the same thing. The cross is only *in whole* what circumcision is *in part;* if the latter is the putting away the sins of the flesh, the former is the putting off the whole flesh of sin. It is putting the axe to the root, and doing away with the evil fruit by extirpating the evil tree. And what is baptism but death in the flesh of sin and life in the spirit of holiness? And that, quite independently of the form of baptism; if immersion and emersion symbolize death and resurrection, no less does any other form of the application of water. The water itself, not simply nor chiefly in its cleansing, but in its quickening, power, contains all the symbolism of death and life. For as the seed is not quickened except it die, so it can neither die nor be quickened save through the action upon it of water. And similarly *we* can neither die in the flesh nor be quickened in the spirit except as we are baptized with that which the water symbolizes, the spirit and power of Christ's death and resurrection; *i.e.* the power of the Divine Spirit by which He died and rose. Jesus Christ,

who was Himself *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*; who Himself, as one of us, crucified, put off, and abolished our flesh of sin, and quickened and raised up in our nature the spirit of life; by His own circumcision, baptism, and resurrection, delivered and delivers us from sin and death.

When we turn from these symbols of His work to the personal experiences enumerated in the Litany, to the fasting and temptation, the agony and bloody sweat and bitter passion, by which He learned obedience, and being Himself perfected, became the author of eternal Salvation to all who believe and obey Him, the case becomes yet clearer. His work was, *through His own self-perfection*, to perfect us; by His own death in the flesh to sin, by His own life in the spirit to God, to become, both objectively in Himself for our faith, and subjectively in us through our faith, our death and life, and so our Salvation.

When our Lord appeals on behalf of Himself and His claims to His *works*, He certainly refers immediately to what we call His *miracles*. "The works that I do, they bear witness of me" (St. John 5:36). But one may see all through the chapter a deeper reference to a more permanent witness to Him. Assuredly those temporary and incidental works were not the work the Father had given Him to do. That work was to be the Resurrection and the Life — and that not in Himself alone, but in every man in all time who should hear, as Lazarus heard in his grave, His divinely enabling "Come forth." It was, and it is, to be the power of His own death and resurrection in every one who be-

lieves and is baptized. To-day the one convincing testimony to our Lord and His divine claims is the works that He does, or rather the one work of human regeneration and resurrection. The man whom He raises up and saves, the Church which is the body of His resurrection and life, believes on Him. And the only way we can prove Him to others is not by deduction of reason, but by testimony of fact. Apart from other very apparent uses, the "miracles" of our Lord were, in a sense, but parables of His real work. As, for example, in the case of the paralytic, where He Himself says: "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, arise and take up thy bed." *To put away sin — that* was His work, and that, by His offering of Himself, *i.e.* by His own crucifixion and abolition of sin. The healing of bodies, except as ultimate effect of the healing of souls, was no part of His work. To make it so now, by modern miracles, faith cures, or any otherwise than as part of the general beneficent work of Christianity, through the sanctified use of natural means, is to elevate what was incidental and temporary into a permanent part of Christianity, and so to lower the true purpose and operation of the latter. The work of Christ is manifested here in risen hearts and minds, and will be manifested *hereafter* in risen bodies. So, again, the raising of Lazarus, *e.g.* was used by our Lord Himself to illustrate or symbolize the fact that He is the resurrection and the life. But it was not His work to raise men back again into natural life as He did Lazarus. That was no more a thing to be habitually *repeated* in the

Church than the daily changing of water into wine for social purposes. Each such miracle taught by visible sign its invisible lesson once for all, and the repetition of the sign, as though that and not the thing signified were Christianity, is not only useless, but injurious to the true end and work of Christ. The resurrection of Lazarus *symbolized*, but only that of Jesus Christ Himself *was* that which He came into the world to effect. It is a resurrection not *in kind*, or in the same kind, but *in another kind*. What is sown is not the body that shall be, and what is raised is not the body that was. Whatever identity connects them, one was the natural body and the other is the spiritual body. His work is primarily a spiritual and moral one, and physical or natural only in its ultimate consequences. It is to die in the old man, or flesh of sin, and to rise in the new spiritual man of holiness, righteousness, and the divine life. The only essential and permanent miracles, therefore, of our Lord — if miracles they ought to be called — are those of His person and of His proper work in raising humanity, in Himself and in His Church, from what it was through the Fall to what it has become by His resurrection.

As with the works or miracles of our Lord, so with His teaching. As I would not undertake to say that the works were not practically necessary to His performing His work in the world, so I would not take away from the value and importance of His oral instruction. But the Sermon on the Mount, or the Parables, or the discourses recorded by St. John — in a word, our Lord's *teaching* was no more His work

than His miracles were. He did not come to *preach*, He came to *be*, the Word of God to us. It is what He *was*, and not what He did or taught, that infinitely and eternally concerns us; or what He did and taught only as these revealed to us what He was. And — let me say it with humility — *our* infinite concern with what our Lord was and is, is not so much the theological question of what He was as God as the human and more practical question of what He became as man, and what we are to become through His manhood.

"Learn of me," says our Lord. It has always been one of the paradoxes of the gospel that the one only selfless man preached only Himself. And He preached His manhood not His Godhood. "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly, and ye shall find rest unto your souls." Take my yoke upon you; bear my cross; walk in my steps. As St. Paul says, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." And St. Peter: "Christ has suffered for you, leaving you an example that you should walk in His steps. Forasmuch as Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same mind; for He that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin." And St. John: he who professes to be and to abide in Christ "ought himself to walk as He walked."

What I wish to illustrate and affirm is, that Jesus Christ speaks with authority in matters of the spiritual and moral life, not because He is God, but because as man He embodies and has realized in His own personal human experience all spiritual and moral truth, righteousness, and life. It is as *Son of Man* that He

is constituted both Lord and Judge of the spiritual and moral world.

When among His last words He said: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. In the world ye have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world," the peace He bequeaths us is, as He says, *His* peace, a peace He has Himself experienced; so perfectly, and so *alone* perfectly, attained and experienced that He is properly called the author of it, as He is elsewhere called the author and perfecter of *faith*. And yet it is an essentially human peace, a peace every man is free to experience as wholly as He; or only not free as he is in bondage to sin. It is the *only* peace of a perfect faith, a perfect obedience, a perfect spiritual and moral ἐνέργεια, or life, in God. "In the world ye have tribulation," and shall have to the end of time. There is no Salvation promised from this, as He was not saved from it. His Salvation and ours is not from, but in and through, tribulation. "But be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." In the world and in the flesh I have conquered the world and the flesh and entered into the peace of God, and my victory and its fruits are all yours!

And as the peace He preached at the close was His, so the poverty, the sorrow, the meekness, the hunger and thirst, He preached at the beginning were His own also. The Beatitudes were but a declaration of His own beatitude. It was because He knew to the bottom the bitterness and the blessedness of that human emptiness and poverty which God has made to receive and contain His divine fulness; the

human sorrow without which there can be no divine joy; the meekness that inherits and possesses the earth; the hunger and thirst which is the condition of all fulness; the mercy that obtains mercy; the purity of heart that sees God; the peacemaking that makes us the children of God — I say that it was because He knew all these Himself, and was in possession of the secret of human life, and had learned all the ways of God and the way to God, that He taught as He taught. He did indeed teach Himself and was Himself all that He taught. He does not say, I will tell you the way, and teach you the truth, and declare to you the life; but I am the way and the truth and the life. And so I repeat, the work of Jesus Christ was not to teach but to be the Word of God, our way to God, because God's truth of us and God's life in us.

It might be said, in seeming refutation of all this, that our Lord's concern was never with Himself. His work was never that of His own personal holiness, righteousness, or life as such. This is true; and it is a truth which it will repay us to dwell upon for a moment. The idea that the end or motive — I do not say the effect or result, but the motive — of Christianity is to save our own souls, is as effectually refuted as a thing can be, by the whole spirit and purpose of our Lord's own life. In contrast with the self-aim, the self-development and perfection, the self-enjoyment, in a word, the egoism, of the ancient or classical ethical systems, the self-forgetfulness as well as self-sacrifice of the Christian principle of ethics is evident enough in its founder and in its

Scriptures, if not always so in actual, so-called, Christianity. To forgive injuries for the magnanimity of it, to sacrifice ourself for the beauty and nobility of self-sacrifice, and not for the sake of those whom we forgive or for whom we suffer, is to do it for self and not for others, and from pride and not love. It is an absolutely true ethical principle that we can never save ourselves by saving ourselves, or save ourselves in any way in *only* saving ourselves. Self must be lost in the *motive*, in order to appear in any real increase or gain as the *result* of our acts. To serve God or our neighbor in order to save ourselves is not serving God or our neighbor, but ourselves, and will not save us; because what we need to be saved from is ourselves.

Of course I do not mean to wholly exclude, or to exclude at all, the motive of our own Salvation, or of a personal self-culture, but only to say that where there is no other or further motive, and no power to forget and lose self in something without and beyond it, then Salvation of self, because Salvation *from* self, is impossible. Our Lord, it is true, cried to Him that was able *to save Him*, and endured the cross *for the reward* that lay before Him. But nevertheless He lived and died for God and others, and not Himself; and the height of His exaltation was measured by the depth of His self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice.

We have shown, and are to show yet more clearly, how truly the *cross* is the only proper symbol of Christ and Christianity; but in reality, the essential principle of both Him and it is not self-denial or self-sacrifice, but love; except, indeed, as these are identi-

cal, in which case, also, it is better to designate them by the positive than by the negative expression of the one principle. Self-denial or sacrifice, *as such only*, is still egoistic; for its motive and its dealing is with self, though it be in the way of denial and surrender. The only possible pure and genuine self-denial is that *love* which forgets and forsakes self, not for the sake of, or with any thought or motive of self, but wholly through thought, and for the sake of, its object. Jesus Christ, therefore, while He is the only pure representative of the principle of the cross, or self-sacrifice, is never, Himself, consciously or intentionally actuated by that motive. For, indeed, that, merely in and for itself, and as an end in itself, is no true motive; and no essential part of Christianity, however it has been often unduly elevated into such. The positive principle of Christ and of Christianity is *love*, which is negatively the only true self-sacrifice, because it is the only unconscious or self-forgetful self-sacrifice, *i.e.* the only self-sacrifice which is not at all for self. So it comes that while the work of Jesus Christ is essential holiness, righteousness, and life in our nature, — which is essential *self-salvation*, — that never appears as His conscious end or motive. While His great achievement was in reality His crucifixion of the flesh, He never, except in certain exceptional crises of temptation, appears to us as crucifying the flesh. But in reality He is always doing so, and most doing so when He is wholly doing something else, and not conscious of doing it at all. For one never crucifies the flesh most truly and effectively by crucifying the flesh, but by walking in

the spirit, and so forsaking and forgetting the flesh. The flesh is never destroyed by fighting; it dies only of abandonment and neglect. And our Lord is so wholly engaged in the life and works of the spirit, *i.e.* in His labor of love, that we seldom see Him sufficiently conscious of the flesh to be engaged in denying or mortifying it. But we must not say that love is not self-sacrifice, because it is so perfect as to have little or nothing in it of the negative motive of sacrifice for self's sake. And we must not say that our Lord's was not the truest and purest crucifixion of the flesh, because He crucified the flesh not by crucifying the flesh, but by walking in the spirit, which is the only effectual not living, and so dying, in the flesh. "Jesus Christ was never saving Himself." On the contrary, He was always saving Himself. "He was concerned only with saving *others*." Yes; but that is the only true Salvation of one's self. "But that was never His thought or intention." Certainly not; if it had been, He would not have been concerned only with others, and not Himself; and so would not have been truly saving Himself. It comes back to the point that, not by self-sacrifice as such, but only by self-sacrificing *love*, is one saved. It is only he who loses himself in the motive, who will find himself in the final result of his actions and life.

We ourselves, like our Lord, are saved only by *love;* for love is the only true death of the flesh and life of the spirit. We are saved by the love of God, but not by the love of God with which we are loved, but with which we love. If God's love *to us* in Christ

is the efficient cause, His love *in us* in Christ is the material cause, of our Salvation; that is to say, it *is* our Salvation, and there can be no other. Nothing less than love — divine love, that love which is God Himself in us — will consume and destroy the self of the flesh, and quicken and kindle the spirit of God and of life in us. So if Jesus Christ went about only doing good, and not thinking of Himself, He was, nevertheless, accomplishing in Himself that which is essentially human ἀπολύτρωσις and τελείωσις. Self-Salvation is nowhere the motive of His human life; but for that very reason His life was the purest and completest Salvation of Himself, and the perfect revelation to us of our own Salvation.

It will be felt by some that, in asserting thus the humanity, I have obscured, if not actually diminished (which would be practically to deny), the divinity of our Lord's work upon earth. It does not appear so to me. If the Son of God was manifested to take away our sin, and in Him in our nature there was no sin, and in us who are and abide in Him there is also no more sin; that is to say, if He *has actually* abolished sin, and brought mankind and the whole creation into oneness with God, into obedience to law, and into perfect realization of itself, I think *that* is a work sufficiently great, sufficiently good, and sufficiently divine to have justified the Incarnation, and to sustain the highest claim we can make for our Lord's person or work. The work that My Father hath given Me to accomplish, the work *that I do*, *that* is My witness that the Father hath sent Me.

The ἔργον, or distinctive work of our Lord, then,

when on earth, consisted, not in His works or miracles, nor in His oral teaching, nor in anything without Himself, but in Himself, in what He became and was as man. In the simple fact — which was yet the grandest fact in the history of the universe — of His personal human sinlessness, He became the conqueror of sin, and so of death, and, in a word, the conqueror and destroyer of the spiritual, moral, and natural evil of the universe. His work does not terminate in Himself, but it began in Himself, as the captain of our Salvation, as the first-begotten from the dead, and the first fruits of the resurrection. Being Himself perfected, He became the author of perfection, or of eternal Salvation to all who believe in and obey Him. He was Himself the Divine Love and Power, ἐν ἐνέργειᾳ, by whose operation in us we are raised from the death of our flesh and ourselves into the selfless life of God in us.

CHAPTER TWENTIETH.

OF JESUS CHRIST AS THE WAY.

Our Lord says: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." He was the life in a unique and absolute sense. The Greeks spoke of the wise man, and the Jews of the righteous man — ὁ σόφος, ὁ δίκαιος — not meaning any actual man, but an ideal man, who should embody, as no actual man ever did or could, their distinctive conceptions of wisdom or righteousness. There *is* such a thing as wisdom; there *is* such a thing as righteousness; and *perfect* wisdom or righteousness, though it be never realized in a single representative. He who should realize it *would be* the wise man, or the righteous man. Christianity holds that wisdom and righteousness *have been* manifested in a life which, because it embodies the full conception and meaning of human life, it calls The Life. Doubtless it is the life because it is *divine* — because it was with God, and came forth from God, and is God's incarnation of Himself in humanity. But it is equally true that it is divine, or that we *know* it to be divine, because it is *the life*, because it so actually and perfectly fulfils and expresses the whole meaning and truth

of human life. The perfect *manhood* of Jesus Christ is the proper proof of His perfect *God-head*. The true artist is revealed in His true art, and not in any claim or authority outside of that. And we rest the truest and strongest claim of our Lord's divinity upon the perfection of His humanity, and not upon any mere authoritative declaration attached to Him as a label to inform us that He is God, nor upon any non-natural, because non-human, manifestation of His deity bearing witness to itself outside of His proper humanity. Because He is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth of human life to every human life that truly knows itself and truly knows Him, *therefore* He is believed on, and is going to be believed on forever, and not upon any external authority, merely as such, even of God Himself. God never meant to finally and forever prove or demonstrate Him by, and our Lord never meant to rest the proof of Himself to the world upon, external declarations or miraculous signs. The fact is, the ultimate proof of *all* truth is its truth, and not its proofs. What is true is going to live in the faith of men, and to prove itself ever more and more to them; no other proof is essential, or can retain its force unimpaired by time or change.

How do we know Christ to be the truth and the life? What can we know if not that! Our faith may be shaken in *any external authority* of God or man, but the Christ of the Gospel and the Church is with us and may be known; and of whether He be the truth and the life, the criterion is within us. When the Greek spoke of his right reason, his wise

man, etc., he was perfectly aware that there was much of wrong reason and unwisdom in the world, and it was calculated to shake his faith in the absoluteness, and not mere relativity, of truth. But the truest of them believed still in a reason to be used aright and a truth to be known, and in the ever-increasing triumph of reason and truth. And, however men err in their following of one or pursuit of the other, in the long run they are capable of knowing the truth if it is revealed, and recognizing the life if it is manifested to them. Wisdom is justified of her children; and as long as the world lasts, Jesus Christ will be believed and lived by those who know themselves and God.

The word truth, as used in the New Testament has, of course, many senses. The predominant one, I think, certainly in St. John, is not so much truth as distinguished from falsehood, as substance or reality as distinguished from appearance, or the actual as distinguished from the merely ideal. As, *e.g.* when St. John (1 John 2:8) says that the law of love is ἀληθες in Jesus Christ. That is, with Him love is not a mere objective law, but a subjective fact: the ideal human motive and conduct is realized and become actual in Him and His life; and through Him in us. And so here, when our Lord says I am the truth and the life, He means that He is the truth of humanity embodied in an actual person, and the life of humanity manifested in an actual human life. He is the realized ideal of human nature, human life, and human destiny.

But when our Lord says not merely I am the truth

and the life, but I am the *way*, the truth, and the life, reference is made to the *process* by which He has *become* the two latter; that is to say, to *how* it is that He has come to realize in His human person the truth of humanity, and in His human life the life of humanity. He has done so by bringing humanity back into union and oneness with God, who is its truth and its life; but the question is, *how* has He done this? To this we may be sure there can be but one answer. Whatever *any* man and *every* man needs to do, or to have done, in him in order to come, or be brought, to God, and to find in Him self-realization and life, has been accomplished in Jesus Christ. He is *all* men's return, and way of return, to God. Our Lord has been talking to His disciples of going to prepare a place for them, and promising that when He has done so He will return and take them to Himself — "that where I am ye may be also." And He adds: "And whither I go ye know *the way*"; or, "And the way whither I go ye know." Thomas questions Him further, and He replies: "*I* am the way; no one cometh to the Father but through me." Now, whatever of mere *local* truth there is in our Lord's going to prepare us a place and then returning to take us to it, that where He is we may be, I have no desire to question. But that, when He says "whither I go ye know the way," — the way really in His mind is not one through space from one place to another, but the spiritual or moral process through which it was necessary for Him to pass in order to bring man into oneness with God, — is apparent from His own explanation, when the figure of His travers-

ing or travelling a way through space is dropped for the truth or fact of His *being* the way to God. "*I* am the way; no man cometh to the Father but by me."

It is the same figure, of course, as when He calls Himself the door. He is our way and our entrance into God in whom we find our truth and our life, and who is thus our μονή, or mansion, our resting and abiding place forever, our home. But the value of this truth lies not in its general statement, but in an analysis in detail of the facts which constitute Jesus Christ our way, and our only way, to God. He can only be so in the sense that in Him we are shown and are able to recognize the spiritual and moral process by which we shall come, or be brought, to God and into God. Come to Him, that is, not in or through space, for we have not to move our place to come to Him: in one and the same spot, wherever it be, one may be infinitely near to, or infinitely remote from, Him. But come to Him in spirit, in truth, and in life. I say that Jesus Christ can only be the way to us by showing us in Himself what it were for *us* to come to God, by being and doing what it is necessary for *us* to be and do in order to be in God. If He, being what we are, has come to God, then we know by Him our way to God. It is true that, as I have several times said, just as we see in Adam, not merely the way in which each man since has fallen or falls, separately and for himself, but the common or universal fall of all men in him; so we see in Christ not the way in which each man, separately and by himself, is to return to God, but the coming

or bringing back of all men in Him. But still we fell in Adam only as we are ourselves actually fallen like him, *i.e.* involved in his sin and death; and so we are restored in Christ only as we ourselves actually become in Him what He is, *i.e.* are partakers of His holiness and life. There is no element or condition of our return to God which has not been realized in Jesus Christ; but equally there is none which has not through Him to be realized in us.

Thus, if the necessary conditions and means of *all* personal or spiritual coming to God, and being and abiding in God, are faith, and prayer, and grace, and obedience, and love, etc., then through all these Jesus Christ came in His humanity to God and was our way. For if He did not come by that which is our only way to the Father, then He is not *our* way to the Father.

Accordingly, we find Him actually coming to God in the perfect use of all these human means of approach. In the first place, He is the "author and finisher," the leader and consummator, of *faith*. "From Him we learn faith. In Jesus Christ we have the perfect example, perfect in realization and in effect, of that faith which we are to imitate, trusting in Him. In His human nature He exhibited faith in its highest form, from first to last; and placing Himself, as it were, at the head of that great army of the heroes of faith, He carried faith, the source of their strength, to its most completed perfection and to its loftiest triumph" (Westcott, Heb. 12:2).

All that our Lord was or did as man and for man was accomplished through faith. His final conquest

of death and resurrection from the grave is distinctly described as an act and triumph of faith on His part.

Nothing can arrest or defeat a faith which is equal to it and which is in the direct line of God's Word and purpose. God does not promise *any* thing and *every* thing to faith; for many things which, in our ignorance, we might ask in faith, and in good faith, would be inconsistent with the true end of our faith and of God's gracious purpose. He does promise us *all things* in Christ, but in order that this promise shall *include* all things that would constitute our absolute spiritual, moral, and natural good, it must *exclude* all things that would be inconsistent with this. Faith, therefore, cannot claim unconditionally as part of the promise in Christ such things as physical health, or wealth, or any of those natural things which we call goods or blessings, but the absence or loss of which may in many instances be to us a yet greater blessing. We have unconditional warrant for faith in *all that Christ is*, and no more or less. But to be and to possess all that Christ is, is all that we can want or that God can give. In Jesus Christ we have humanity's conquest of all evil, and attainment of all good by the one human way of faith. What He conquered was sin and death; and what He attained was God, righteousness, and eternal life. And I repeat that Jesus Christ was sinless *through faith*, and rose from the dead *through faith*, and was one with God, and obeyed His law, and lived His life *through faith*. His last though not greatest victory of faith was His physical conquest of death, to which He is described as going with the words

of the Psalmist in His mouth, the perfect expression of supremest faith under the extremest conditions of trial and temptation. "I beheld the Lord always before my face; for He is on my right hand that I should not be moved; therefore my heart was glad and my tongue rejoiced; moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope, because Thou will not leave my soul in Hades; neither wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou madest known unto me the ways of life; Thou shalt make me full of gladness with Thy countenance." He believed unto death, and God through His faith saved Him out of death.

That our Lord was absolutely dependent upon and perfect in *prayer;* that through it He was filled without measure with that divine *grace*, which is measured in God's giving only by the limitations of our own power of receiving: that through faith and prayer and grace He was perfected in His human *obedience* and *life*, is not only in accordance with the mind of the whole New Testament, but it is the only sense in which He is to us the way of truth and life and the only *way to the Father.*

But there is something more than this under the figure of speech we are discussing. Our Lord says: "If any man serve Me let him follow Me; and *where I am there shall also my servant be.*" He has, indeed, prepared a place for us; and He comes again to receive each one of us unto Himself, that where He is we may be also. But if we would be with Him we must follow Him, and follow Him by the way He has gone. When the sons of Zebedee would follow Him and be at his right and left hand in His

kingdom, our Lord asks them a significant question: Can ye drink my cup, and be baptized with my baptism? He never fails to couple all following Him with the taking up His *cross* and bearing it after Him. The only way He knew or has left us is the *via crucis*. The new and living way which He consecrated for us into the holy of holies was through the veil of His rent flesh. "When He had overcome the sharpness of death He opened the kingdom of Heaven to all believers."

We have in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as alluded to just above, the most detailed and definite description of the way which our Lord has made or opened, and which He Himself *is* to us. In Heb. 9:8, etc., we are shown that in the time preceding the Christian covenant and dispensation the *need* of a way to God was constantly taught and more and more felt. But not only was the way itself not yet opened or made manifest, but the fact of the contrary was symbolized by the Veil of the Temple, which closed and barred the access of the people to the Holy of Holies, or the presence of God. The annual act of the High Priest in entering within the veil on the great day of atonement was at once a witness to the fact that the veil of separation was not yet taken away and a promise and prophecy that it should be taken away. But *now* — "in the present time," or under the Christian covenant and dispensation — the barrier or wall of separation has been removed, and we have boldness to enter into the Holiest Place (which is the symbol of our at-one-ment, or accomplished oneness with God) "by the blood of Jesus, by the way which

He dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh: therefore let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith," etc. Now what was the veil, or wall of separation, between us and God, which was only taken away in the act of our Lord's death, and what was the way to God thus laid open for us?

The *veil*, we are told, *was His flesh*. Of course we are subjected by the limitations of human language to an unavoidable ambiguity in the use of terms. From this the New Testament itself is not free in using the term *flesh* sometimes in the sense of that essential human nature which our Lord Himself now wears in His exaltation, and sometimes again in the sense of that fallen nature of the first Adam which He crucified and left behind Him in His grave. It is the same ambiguity which we feel in the use of the term φύσις, or nature, when we are told both that we are sinners φύσει, by nature, and yet that all sin is παρὰ φύσιν, against or contrary to nature. Of course, as things are, we cannot separate our nature proper from our sinful nature, or nature as sinful, or our flesh from our flesh of sin, and in suffering in one we cannot but suffer in the other. And so our Lord in crucifying the σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας suffered in that σὰρξ which in Him is now free from sin; that is, in crucifying in the nature that in it which needed to be crucified for its own sanctification and perfection there was involved a crucifixion of the nature which was sanctified and perfected, just as the gold itself is melted in the heat which consumes its dross.

If we should attempt to state the distinction be-

tween the σάρξ merely as such and as σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, between the flesh as flesh and as flesh of sin, under the bondage of sin and death, it would be difficult to do so directly, and yet I think it may be made intelligible in a somewhat indirect way.

Every one of us feels that holiness, righteousness, and life are the true law of our nature; that anything else is ἀνομία, or a contradiction of this law; that therefore our nature is essentially good; and that sin and death are παρὰ φύσιν, or contradictory and destructive of it. If our nature were subject to its law, *i.e.* if it were at itself and what it ought to be, we should be good. In *that* sense we are *by nature* good, *i.e.* in the essential constitution and according to the true law of our nature. But it is not so with us. Just what the universal and indisputable fact which we call the Fall is *in our nature*, it is hard to define. But what it results in *in ourselves* we know well enough; viz. in our universal and inevitable subjection to the false or counter law of sin and death, insomuch that we are now said to be φύσει, or by nature, subject to evil and "children of wrath," the very term φύσις being used to designate no longer our real or essential, but our actual or fallen nature.

In consequence of the fallen condition of our universal nature, virtue or essential manhood for us, so far from being, as the ancients defined it, a following of nature, involves and consists in a denial and crucifixion of nature. That is, the fulfilling of our essential, or real nature, demands of us an ἀθέτησις, the annulling and undoing, of our actual or false nature.

Now, the New Testament being immediately concerned with the great facts of the Fall and its remedy, sin and Salvation, both φύσις and σάρξ are, not exclusively but predominantly, used in the sense of our actual, and not that of our real or essential, nature; *i.e* to describe our fallen condition.

In accordance with this view of the facts, the barrier between us and God is in our φύσις or σάρξ, not as this is according to its essential constitution, but as it is in its actual condition. The veil that closes to us all access to the Holiest Place is that of our flesh. It is only as this has been rent in twain from top to bottom by our Lord's perfect crucifixion of the flesh of sin that the way has been thrown wide open to us into the presence and favor of God. It is an essential truth which the Epistle to the Hebrews brings out, that without blood there can be no real ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίας; that there is no real διαθήκη, or covenant relation with God, save through sacrifice; that wherever there is such covenant there must, of necessity, be involved the death of him who enters into it; for that a covenant with God is good only over dead bodies, ἐπὶ νεκροῖς, *i.e*. the dead selves of those who make it. That in Heb. 9:16, the ὁ διαθέμενος whose death must be brought as the condition of the covenant, is the man who is to be taken into relation with God, is proved by the fact that the passage is an evident reference to Ps. 50:5, — "Gather My saints together unto Me, those that have made a covenant with Me by sacrifice," — where the Greek is τοὺς διατιθεμένους τὴν διαθήκην.

It is not, of course, an arbitrary disposition on

God's part which prevents any access to Him save with blood, or through sacrifice; but it is in the nature and necessity of the thing itself that we cannot spiritually come to God, and be one with Him, save through the sacrifice or death in us of that which separates us from Him.

The way, then, to God, and the only way for us, is through the rent veil of our flesh. In the Jewish tabernacle, the Holy of Holies, or the Holy Place, symbolized, not merely the presence and favor of God, but that which is the essential condition of both these, — personal and spiritual oneness with God: that which is the end of all religion, and pre-eminently the end of the final and absolute religion, — absolute holiness, absolute righteousness, and absolute life. The first tabernacle, or πρώτη σκηνή, was the place of, and represented, that relative and temporary religion and worship of the first covenant by which God was preparing His people for the absolute and final religion and worship of the second. As long as the former continued, and the veil still closed and barred the way into the Holy of Holies, the fact or truth symbolized by it was this: that the *Way to God* was not yet made or opened. That was not yet done which should — not merely as those old sacrifices had done, represent or signify, but — *be* and *effect* the removal of the separation between us and God. What it should be which should effect this, although it was not yet made manifest, was fixed and determined from the beginning, not by any arbitrary counsel of God, but by the facts and necessities of the case. If Jesus Christ was to be our Salvation,

He must be what alone our Salvation can be and must be. That is, He must be the putting off of the flesh, and putting on of the spirit. He must be the crucifixion — as I have said before, in default of any more definite and exact statement of what "the flesh of sin" is — of all in our nature which disposes us to sin and subjects us to death, of all that which not to crucify *would be* sin and death, and to crucify which is holiness and life. That this is what the Epistle to the Hebrews understands to have been what our Lord did which opened the way to us into not merely the presence and favor, but a real union and oneness with God, we may infer from ch. 10 : 19, etc. "Having, therefore, Brethren, boldness to enter in the Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which He dedicated for us, a new and living way, *through the veil; that is to say, His flesh*," etc. That is, as, when our Lord died upon the cross, the Veil of the Temple was rent from top to bottom, and the Holy Place was thrown open, which up to that time had been closed, and had barred all entrance to the Mercy Seat, which was the symbol of God's presence; so, by the death of our Lord upon the cross, *the flesh*, our old Adam, or σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, *all* the barrier which our nature or natural condition interposed between us and God, is rent in twain and swept away, and an open way and free access made for us into God. The result of this is that Jesus Christ is Himself ὁ πνευμάτικος, the spiritual man, as contrasted with Adam, the carnal or natural man, and that through His death and resurrection we are represented as no longer in the flesh which is dead, but in the spirit which is quickened and raised up.

If, then, Jesus Christ is *The Life*, the realization of human life in its fulness, free from all contradiction or limitation; if He is *The Truth*, the perfect revelation of both God and man, or of God in man and man in God; the incarnation and embodiment of the Divine Idea which is the eternal truth of man, — He is these only because He was first *The Way;* because He *became* these by those human dispositions and acts by which alone humanity can attain to its truth and its life.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIRST.

OF THE SACRIFICES OF JESUS CHRIST.

It is unnecessary to discuss the origin in history of the notion of sacrifice. It is universal. It has appeared under more perverted and hideous forms than perhaps any other principle of human nature. But it *is* a principle, and a very essential principle of human nature and human life; and so far from its perversions disproving its truth, there is no better illustration of the old Greek assertion that the perversion of the *best* is always the *worst*. The truth of sacrifice is the essence of all religion and of all morality, for it is identical with the principle of *love*.

Although the full meaning of sacrifice is reached and expressed only in the life and act of Jesus Christ, yet all the elements of the truth contained in it are to be found in a less developed form in the Jewish sacrificial system. Into the details of this system I do not purpose at all to enter. Such general and generally accepted interpretation of it as is necessary for our present purpose may be found, as Aristotle says, ἐν τοῖς ἐγκυκλίοις, in current treatises on the subject, and may be taken thence for our use.

According to all classifications, then, the Jewish

sacrifices, although somewhat numerously subdivided, fall under three heads, the peace offering, the burnt offering, and the sin offering. Each of these forms of sacrifice embodies a principle which is a constituent element of religion and of worship; and the three taken together, as they were in Jewish worship after its development under Moses, include all the essential principles of religion and worship.

Thus the *peace offering* embodied the principle of fellowship, or union and communion, of man with God. There were other ideas, of course, involved in this, — such as homage, thanksgiving, dependence, and prayer on man's part; and on God's, grace or self-communication, — but on the whole and in its developed form the truth of the peace offering was that of the essential spiritual connection of man's life with that of God. The common meal at the table of the Lord, which was the principal element in the offering, was the symbol and expression of the common life. There was not in this sacrifice taken by itself any recognition of a *separation* of life between man and God which needed to be closed, or of an at-one-ment which needed to be accomplished, in order to union and communion. This latter is supposed to exist, and is simply expressed and sacramentally sustained by the sacrifice and the sacrificial feast. It might be added that as both God and man are supposed to partake of this feast in its spiritual elements, in a certain sense it represents to both their "daily bread." As man's life is fed daily, in this act of union and communion, by the life of God, so at least the divine goodness and love is fed daily,

and satisfied, by the homage, the thanksgiving, and the being blessed by Him of the objects of it. "What shall I render unto the Lord in return for His blessings? I will take the cup of Salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord." We may indeed *bless* God by fitly receiving His blessing. In this true sense our true sacrifices are a sweet savour to Him; they satisfy and gratify a desire and a want which even in the divine nature is inseparable from love, the *need* of communicating or imparting itself. And so God says to us as we say to Him, "Give me my daily bread" (See Westcott on Hebrews, p. 287).

As the principle of the peace offering was the distinctively *spiritual* one of community or fellowship of life with God, so that of the *burnt offering* was the more specifically *moral* one of self-devotion to the service of God, or obedience. As I have frequently expressed the difference, the idea of the peace offering is holiness, the principle of which is faith; that of the burnt offering is righteousness, of which the principle is obedience; the one is a personal relation to God's person, the other is a practical and active conformity to His law. Of course, the first is but the root of the second, and the second but the fruit of the first. The distinctive feature of the burnt offering, or whole burnt offering, was that the sacrifice, representing the offerer, was laid upon the altar *whole*, and there *wholly* consumed. It was supposed all to ascend to God in the incense and smoke of the offering, which, in the bold Eastern imagery of the Bible, was grateful and acceptable in His nostrils. So He whose meat and drink it was to do

His Father's will, who was eaten up or consumed by zeal for His Father's house, who spent Himself, and was spent, in His Father's service, was the true personal embodiment of the principle of the whole burnt offering. Here again there is no recognition in this sacrifice itself of anything in us which contradicts or renders impossible any such self-devotion and service. The fact of a bondage to a false law within us which renders us impotent to obey the true law of God and ourselves, and the need of a redemption in order to an obedience, is not taken into account.

These two offerings would represent and embody all of religion and worship and morality (for the love and service of God includes the fulfilling of all other relations and duties), if man were unfallen. But inasmuch as he is fallen, union with God must be preceded by a bringing into union, or reconciliation; and self-devotion and obedience must be preceded by a redemption, or being made free to obey God's law. It was to cover the sense of *this* need, of which men were only gradually made conscious; to awaken and develop this need as well as to meet and satisfy it; that the *sin offering* in due time took its place in the religious and ritual system of the Jews. And when it did do so it was made the condition precedent to the other two offerings, which were always prepared for and rendered possible by this, so that the sacrifice of communion should always be preceded by the sacrifice of atonement, and the sacrifice of obedience by that of redemption.

What, then, was the religious truth expressed in the sin offering? It was the great and universal

truth for man of the necessity of the death of the flesh in order to the possibility of the life of the spirit. It was the fact, if not in the constitution, yet in the condition of our nature, that for man there is no life except through death. I say not in the essential constitution of our nature; and yet, as I have several times shown, there would be something corresponding to death necessary to life in us, even if our nature were not in its actual fallen condition. Merely as natural, the task devolves upon us of *becoming* spiritual, of passing from the natural into a personal relationship to God, which constitutes sonship, and makes us a new creation in Christ, in whom it attains its full type and image. This transformation from an old into a new, from self and nature into God, by the creative power of the Word and the Spirit acting through and in our faith and obedience, would be somewhat of the nature of a death in one kind, and a life in another kind. We should have to leave behind us the flesh, in at least its possibility of sinning, and I will not say that to do this would involve *nothing* of self-denial, or contain in it *no* germ of self-sacrifice. But in this case, while there would be all of the birth in us of a new, there would be little or nothing of the death of an old. There would be nothing of which we should need to be unclothed in order to be clothed upon.

But if our constitution, while it calls for a change from one stage into another — "first the natural and then the spiritual" — calls for no *death* from one into the other, our condition *does*. The natural, or fleshly, nature in us — not as either natural or fleshly

in the essential sense of the words, but as so in the actual sense which the fact of the Fall has given to them — has in every man to be denied, to be subdued, to be destroyed, in order to a true spiritual, moral, and real life in us. "*The flesh must die in order to the life of the spirit.*"

Let us see, now, what we may learn in a preparatory way from the Jewish sin offering. The animal offered represented the offerer; its death represented the death of the offerer; and it was a death περὶ ἁμαρτίας — *i.e.* having special reference to the fact of sin. This reference has in the nature of the case a twofold aspect. In one aspect the death περὶ ἁμαρτίας is a death for, or in consequence of, sin, and in another aspect it is a death from sin. That in us which sins, or would sin, which is the seat and source of the possibility of sin and of all impulse and temptation to sin, must die for or because of sin, before that in us which is to be saved can die (as our Lord died) *to* or from sin. The former is the sinful nature, or the nature as sinful. It is the old man in us, the old husband in union with whom we bring forth only sin, and will continue to do so as long as he lives or we live in him. It is the flesh of sin, in reference to which the position of the New Testament is, that it is impossible to separate sin from our flesh, and that Salvation requires the separation from us of the whole flesh of sin. The cross is the only effectual and complete circumcision. On the other hand, that in us which is to be saved by dying to, and from, sin is the *we*, not of our carnal nature, but of our spiritual and moral personality, that of which St. Paul

says: The sin I do *I* know not, *I* allow not, *I* do not. It is not I that do it, but sin dwelling in my flesh. I consequently am emancipated, and live only by the death of the flesh in me, which death is my death *in it* for sin, but *in myself* from sin or to sin.

In this death there is both a passive and an active element. Inasmuch as I am identified with my fallen nature, or flesh, as I am in it and suffer all that befalls it, the death represented by the Jewish sin offering is on my part a passive death for sin. I suffer in it the consequences of sin. St. Paul teaches no exemption from the universal law that death follows sin for every child of Adam. Christ has purchased for us no exemption from this law. The ground of our justification, as of our sanctification, is that in Christ we *have* died and *shall* die for our sins. He alone who has died is either judicially justified, or actually freed from sin. And if there were not a real sense in which we both did and shall die in Christ because of and for sin, there would be for us no real justification or sanctification. I have shown how these two are identical in fact, and only differ in the point of view; that our death for sin in the flesh, which is our death to and from sin in the spirit, viewed objectively, and as accomplished for us in Christ, is our justification, and viewed subjectively as to be accomplished, or as being accomplished, in us in Christ, is our sanctification. Viewed, then, I repeat, as identified with, or being in, our flesh, the death for sin is *passive*, or inflicted upon us. That in us which is sinful, or which in us will be sin, must die; in that in us in which we are sinful, or will be if it lives in us, we

must die. If we are now justified, or treated and viewed as though we were not sinners, it is because we are viewed and treated as having in Christ died in that old man in whom we were or would be sinners. If in any degree we are now sanctified, it is because in that degree we have in Christ actually died in the old man, or nature of sin, and are living in the new man, or personal spirit of holiness and life.

But if we are, on the other hand, viewed as identified not with our flesh, but with that real selfhood or spirit which in every man is akin to God, and never consents to the flesh of sin, but protests against it and longs for deliverance from it and for the liberty of the children of God, then the death *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is active rather than passive. That is, it is death which is not so much suffered by us as inflicted upon ourselves. It is not our being crucified in the flesh, but rather ourselves gladly and joyfully crucifying the flesh with all in it that lusts or wars against the spirit.

Applying the *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in both these aspects to Jesus Christ, we see both a difference and an identity in that which took place in Him and which takes place in us. When it is said (Heb. 4:15) that our great High Priest was tempted in all points like us, *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, in this "without sin" we may distinguish two points of difference in Him from us. First, though tempted like us He did not sin. Whatever possibility of sin or temptation to sin there was in His flesh or in His environment, *He* was sinless. But, *secondly*, in *one* respect He was

not tempted like us; there was a difference in the temptation itself, as well as in His conduct under it. A very large part of our temptation comes not from our flesh merely, which is without ourselves, but from ourselves, or from our own previous yielding to the flesh. After we have ourselves once sinned, though it be only in thought or will, that which was before only without us, and which if kept out would not have been ours, has become our sin. And the temptation which would have been in itself sinless if it had proceeded only from our nature, or from the effect upon our nature of the sin of others, now that it proceeds in part from *our* sin is no longer so. Our Lord was sinless not only under temptation, but in the fact of the temptation itself, because no part of it came from Himself. Whatever of it came not from mere outward situation, but from His flesh and from that ἀσθένεια or weakness of the flesh with which He like us was girt (Heb. 5:2 and 4:15), was the effect not of His own, but of Adam's sin, and was a part of that burden which He took upon Himself that He might remove it from us. There was no sin of His own which appealed to Him in the way of temptation, there was no sin of His own which had to be crucified in Him, or which He had to crucify in Himself. Nevertheless, there was that in Him — not in Himself, but in His flesh — which, for sin and because of sin not His own, had to die passively, and which actively He had to put to death. He took, and therefore had to bear, *our sins* in their consequences in His flesh and in their assault upon Him through His flesh. The simple fact that our

Lord in His flesh was subject to the natural death of men who are fallen was a passive endurance on His part of a consequence of our sin. It was a part of that sin and that curse for sin which "He was made for us" by the simple fact of entering into our nature as it was.

But the fact of subjection to natural or physical death was but a part, and the least part, of His taking our sin and bearing our curse. All that He suffered passively in His flesh, and all that He achieved actively in His personal and spiritual conquest of the flesh, was the *undoing* and *throwing off* of that flesh of sin and sin in the flesh which He took for the purpose of condemning and destroying. The so-called *passive obedience* of our Lord was His voluntary endurance of the sin of the world, the curse of the law, and the wrath of God, laid upon Him not merely by imputation, but in fact, through His entrance into, and life and death in, our flesh. In that flesh He took and bore in a real sense its sin, its curse, and its penalty.

He took its *sin* not of course, personally or in the sense that He Himself in any wise came under it or was sinful, but in the sense that *in order to be sinless* He had to subdue, crucify, and destroy it in His flesh or assumed nature. And this is what is meant by His having in the flesh of sin condemned sin in the flesh; by His being ὁ ἁγιάζων, the Sanctifier — or *maker* holy from unholy — of the humanity which He took to Himself; as in Eph. 5 the husband is described as being the *sanctifier* of the wife.

He took its *curse* in that, "made of a woman,"

He was "made under the law"; that in His person our old man, or flesh of sin, came under the condemnation, sentence, and execution of the law — *was crucified*. The old man is the representative in us not only of sinful, but of *dead* works. What Christ died in and put off was not in His case an old man of actual sins, but an inherited nature, which had to be died in and put off in order not to sin. It was an old nature, in which one is impotent for holiness, righteousness, and life, and therefore (unless, as by Him, it is thrown off) under the dominion of sin, disobedience, and death. The law applied to one in the flesh only makes upon him impossible demands, convicts and convinces him of sin, and is the minister to him of condemnation and death. Now I say that Jesus Christ, as *in the flesh*, was under *its curse*. In it He bore the curse inherent in it, and He did so in the fact of the necessity of its crucifixion in His person.

Among the elements enumerated in Heb. 6:1 as the first principles of Christ and of Christianity, the very first is repentance, not from sinful, but from *dead* works. What our Lord put off was, as I have said, not sins which He had Himself committed, but a nature impotent or dead for holiness, and in which He could only not sin by putting it off. And what *we* put off and are saved from in Him is not our sins (or the guilt or punishment of them) in so far as they are past, but only in so far as they are still present in us as a sinful nature or condition, and stand between us and God, *i.e.* between us and a community of nature and

a real union and communion of person with God. What we put off and are saved from, I say, in Christ is not our sins, but our nature of sin, the old man in whom we have sinned and will continue to sin as long as we are in him. Jesus Christ was the death of the old man in Himself and in us. "Our old man was crucified with Him." "I by the law died to the law. I am crucified with Christ."

If the gist of Salvation by Christ consisted in His bearing the *guilt* of *past sins*, this could be laid upon Him only by imputation; He could have died for us only vicariously, substitutionarily, or representatively. If it consisted in His breaking the *power* and abolishing the *fact* of *present sin*, He did and does this by being in Himself and in us the power of God unto sinlessness and holiness, and His death is not a death instead of ours, but is in a very real sense *our* death. It is our death passively *in*, and actively *from*, all that in us from which we need to be saved; our death in the flesh of sin and from the flesh of sin.

Our sin offering represents *us*, and His death means *our* death, and there is an efficacy in His sacrifice which the Jewish sacrifice had not, *in this fact:* that whereas they could *only* represent and mean, He can *be* what He represents and His death can *effect* what it means. The very peculiarity of Christ's baptism is that it is not only with water but with spirit, not only in sign but in power, that it *effects* and *is* all that it signifies or means. Even the Quaker, who denies the use of water baptism, believes in the reality of spirit baptism; and surely no Christian of any name can deny that the Christianity of Christ claims to be

and is a baptism from above with and into the spirit and power and reality of all that Jesus Christ Himself is. To be baptized, then, by Him and into Him, to be taken by Him into the fellowship of His death and resurrection, not only means but *is* our death in the flesh and our life in the spirit, our death to sin and our life to God.

But there *is* a true sense in which Christ died for the guilt of all past sin: inasmuch, *i.e.* as all death is not only the natural but the judicial and penal consequence of all the spiritual, moral, and natural transgression which has made it necessary or produced it. In *this* sense, all the sin of the world, all the curse of the law, and all the wrath of God was visited upon Him: that He had to crucify, and be crucified in, a nature which was made what it was in Him by the sin of the world, and in which He could only be sinless and be saved by its condemnation and destruction. Viewed thus as in our flesh and as crucified in it; as undergoing the condemnation, the curse, and the death of it; as enduring in His human person all that it was necessary for the flesh to suffer in order to the freedom and life of the spirit and the Salvation of humanity, — our Lord must be said to have rendered to God a perfect passive obedience. He suffered all that every man must suffer in order to be saved — that is, a perfect death in the flesh. But it was only as viewed *in His flesh* that our Lord can be said to have passively endured or suffered the death of the cross. In Himself — in His spirit or human personality — the cross was an act of the intensest and most perfect

active obedience. It was not a mere being crucified, but a self-crucifixion in the highest and most real sense. All that the flesh endured the spirit in Him inflicted; it was actively His life in the spirit which was in itself passively His death in the flesh. It is utterly impossible to separate our Lord's active and His passive obedience. Every breath, or movement, or activity of life in the spirit is negatively just so much death in the flesh, and there is no possible passive death in the flesh except in active life in the spirit. There was no condemnation or penalty inflicted by God upon Jesus Christ which was not inflicted by Himself upon Himself. If we are saved by what He *suffered* in the death in Him of our flesh, then, not equally only, but identically, we are saved by what He *did* in the victory, emancipation, and resurrection of our spirit in Him. In the nature of the thing, in our Lord or in ourselves, there is no death of the flesh but in life of the spirit, and no life of the spirit but in death of the flesh.

But Salvation is not only by the grace but by the providence of God. God saves us not only by what He does *in* us, but by what He does *to* us; and *we* are saved not only by what we do, but by what we suffer. Our Lord Himself was perfected in holiness, righteousness, and life, *i.e.* in faith, obedience, and all the activities of His personal, spiritual, manhood, *διὰ παθημάτων, ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*, by the external experiences, trials, and sufferings of His life on earth. His sufferings would never alone, without Himself and the grace of God in Him, have sanctified Him, but neither, humanly speaking, could He have sancti-

fied Himself or been sanctified without them. Taking the extreme *πάθημα* of the cross, it was only in the divine infliction upon Him that He could have inflicted upon Himself that condemnation and death of sin in the flesh, which, as it was the extremest point of His passive, so was it the supremest act of His active obedience.

So all of religious truth that was, not contained, because it could not contain it all, but that was prefigured and pointed to by the Jewish sin offering, was realized in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. In His flesh He died for and because of sin; He died in all that which the entrance and the prevalence of sin in the world rendered necessary should die in us, in that which must die in every man in order to holiness, righteousness, and life. He died in it *passively* in that *it* is in itself and by nature under condemnation and subject to death; and, moreover, in that God by His external dealings with us Himself inflicts, as by His grace within He helps and enables *us* to inflict, suffering and death upon the flesh. He died in it *actively* in that He Himself in His human personality was never merely the crucified in, but always also the crucifier of, the flesh. His death in the flesh was *His* death to sin and from sin; it was an obedience on His part unto death and by means of death.

And the life and death of Jesus Christ contained in it the truth of not only this, but all the sacrifices and offerings of the Jewish law.

He was the perfect *sin offering* in that His death, by which I mean not only His physical death, but

the whole death of His active and passive obedience, combined and concentrated in itself all the elements of a death περὶ ἁμαρτίας — the death of the flesh for sin and of the spirit from sin.

He was the perfect *burnt offering* in that His life and death was one act of perfect self-consecration, devotion, and service. He laid Himself wholly upon the altar of obedience to God, and was wholly consumed in accomplishing His Father's will.

He was the perfect *peace offering*, because in Him was realized a perfect human oneness — of spirit, nature, and life — a perfect spiritual union and communion, with God.

And our Lord was not only these three, but the three in this order. It was only through His perfect self-sacrifice, or crucifixion of the flesh, that He was perfect righteousness or obedience, and perfect holiness or spiritual oneness with God.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SECOND.

OF JESUS CHRIST AS OUR HIGH PRIEST.

THE ideas and figures f the Old Testament have their antitypes and fulnlment in the New. It is sometimes the desire and design of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews to identify and sometimes to distinguish the Old and the New; sometimes, *e.g.* to prove that Jesus Christ was the true sacrifice or the true High Priest, and sometimes to show that He was something higher and absolute, which high priesthood and sacrifice only imperfectly symbolized or typified. The former, the identification of the truths or facts of the New Testament with the ideas and signs of the Old, was necessary for manifest reasons in one whose immediate purpose it was to lead the Jews on from the old into the new religion. It is helpful to us still and will always have its use; but with our knowledge now of the person and work of Jesus Christ, it is these which throw light upon the figures rather than the figures upon these. The truth is more and greater than its shadows, and we should not be satisfied to interpret and express it only in the inadequate terms of them.

What is contained in the notion or figure that

Jesus Christ is our great High Priest? I wish to answer this question in terms more literal and definite than the mere repetition of the figure itself, *i.e.* to translate the figure into the facts which it strove to express.

The High Priest of humanity is, then, *first*, He who embodies the true and perfect concept or notion or truth of humanity; who interprets or reveals humanity to itself, or represents and expresses it to others. In this sense it is identical with the title which our Lord so commonly applied to Himself, *Son of Man;* by which He designated Himself (Thayer's *Lexicon*, under *υἱός*) as "the head of the human race, *the* man *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the one who both furnished the pattern of the perfect man and acted in behalf of all mankind."

Secondly, and more specifically, the High Priest represented humanity in its relations to God (*ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*) *i.e.* as coming and as come into the perfection of its predestined relation to God; as man in whom God has fulfilled Himself and who consequently has fulfilled himself in God, through and in a perfect faith, obedience, and life. In this sense the High Priest is He in whom humanity has become "Son of God." Thus in Heb. 5 : 5 our Lord is said to have been glorified and consecrated by God to be High Priest in the words, "Thou art my Son. This day have I begotten Thee." *This day* meaning the day of His resurrection, and the sonship consummated on that day being the perfected relation into which humanity was brought to God in the human person of Jesus Christ,

and by the completion of the act of at-one-ment. Ἀρχιερεύς is related to Υἱός as we have previously seen Λόγος to be. Λόγος is the divine concept or truth of man as eternally pre-existing in the mind of God in the personal Logos. Ἀρχιερεύς is man as he has in Jesus Christ realized the τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, all his divine relations. But both these terms in themselves lack a *content*. They do not tell us *what* was the eternal thought and predestination of man in the Divine Mind, nor *what* are the relations to God in the fulfilment of which in Jesus Christ he has realized the divine idea and his own meaning and destination. The term Υἱὸς Θεοῦ supplies this content. The Logos is incarnated and the High Priest enters into the divine presence in the fact of the perfected *sonship* of man, *i.e.* in the fact that Jesus Christ by His own perfect human holiness, obedience, and life has brought humanity into a spiritual, moral, and natural oneness with God; that God has reproduced His spirit, His nature, *Himself*, in man, and man by such birth from above has been made Son of God. The High Priest is thus Himself, first of all, Son of Man and Son of God, and secondly, He is the way or the entrance for humanity into all that He Himself is.

But, *thirdly*, we have seen how for humanity there can be but one *way*, or *entrance*, into any real relation with God. It is no arbitrary or meaningless condition that the High Priest can enter into the Holy of Holies only through the rent veil of His flesh, and bringing with Him the blood of His perfect self-sacrifice. It thus becomes the most prominent, if

not the most essential, function of the high priesthood "*to offer sacrifice.*" But, in fact, this is an accidental and *not* the essential function of the High Priest. It is but a condition or means to the real end, which is first to *represent* and secondly to *bring* man to God. And even if man were unfallen he would still have to be brought to God, through the becoming himself and the fulfilling of all his personal relations to God. There is no reason to doubt that he would still have needed the objectively incarnated High Priest of his profession who as Son of Man and Son of God should realize first for or to him and then in him his true ἔργον and destiny. But in that case while there should have been still an entrance into the Holy of Holies it would have been *without blood.* There may have been in the functions of the High Priest of an unfallen humanity the truth of the burnt and the peace offering, but even in these the element of sacrifice would scarcely exist; and certainly the sin offering would not be found at all. But, I repeat, in our actual condition, the most accentuated and conspicuous function of a high priesthood for us is sacrifice, and the sacrifice of the sin offering. *Our* High Priest cannot enter into the Holy of Holies, He cannot bring humanity in His person to God, and represent it in the realization and perfection of all its divine relations, save through His own rent flesh and with His own shed blood. He must become our at-one-ment or *bringing* into oneness with God, our redemption or being *made free* from an actual bondage, our resurrection from the *dead*, before He can be our holiness, our right-

eousness, and our life. In a word, He must be the death of our flesh before He can be the life of our spirit.

Assuming now that we have correctly defined in what *objectively* consisted the high priesthood of Jesus Christ, the more difficult question remains of the *how* of our own *subjective* relation to it. We are not saved by anything that our Lord Himself was or did merely through our belief in it as an objective fact. His death, *e.g.* or His resurrection cannot possibly otherwise avail us than by in some way becoming and actually *being* our own death and resurrection. It is only as we can and shall ourselves *live it* that His life can be of any use to us. An objective Salvation is only a Salvation at all as it is capable of being, and is to be, subjectively realized. The essence of faith in Christ is the assurance that "we are *partakers* with Him and of Him if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end" (Heb. 3:14).

I have tried to bring out this truth by showing how in the New Testament Jesus Christ is in every sense our Salvation not merely exemplarily, nor merely causally, but personally and really. That is, He Himself personally in us is *Himself* our Salvation. It is in accordance with this that the element of *sympathy* is made so much of in the character of the High Priest. In the first place, the High Priest must have been all that we are; and experienced and suffered all that we must suffer; and done and become all, and in the same way and by the same means, that we are to do and become.

But in the second place, this συμπαθεῖν of our High Priest not only *was* a past, but *is* a present fact. It consists not merely in the identity of what He was and suffered and accomplished when on earth with what we are, suffer, and are to accomplish, but in the identity of Him with us and us with Him in what He was, suffered, and did then, and what we suffer, do, and are *now*. His sufferings were ours, and ours are His, because of His power to enter into us and our experiences, and to impart to us the power to enter into Him and His experiences. Thus He makes His death ours and His life ours, and wholly re-enacts in us what He enacted first in Himself.

It has been said that "St. Paul's most distinctive doctrines are merely expositions of the meaning of two great facts, the death of Christ and the mission of the Spirit by the glorified Redeemer." In what real sense is our Lord the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost if not in *this* — that by His spiritual presence in us He imparts to us the power and the reality of His own death and resurrection? No one can read St. Paul, St. Peter, or St. John without feeling how much, not what Jesus Christ did is our objective Salvation, but Jesus Christ Himself is our subjective Salvation. All that we are in the new life into which we are born by His baptism is no longer *we*, but *He*, the risen, living, personal Christ in us. "*I* live no longer, *Christ* lives in me" (Gal. 2:20).

There are here two opposite misinterpretations to be avoided. The first is that of supposing that Christ is in us merely by influence, or effect, or resemblance in us to what He *was*, instead of being Himself in us

in the ever *present* power and fact of His death and resurrection. Which is what is meant by the repeated statement that the saving acts of our Lord were all *once for all*, *i.e.* operated once, but operating always, *once* in Him, *forever* in us. So that His death is a continuous dying, and His resurrection a continuous rising on our part throughout all time. The other misapprehension is that of so conceiving St. Paul's "not I, but Christ in me" as to practically do away with our own personality. In one sense our personality *is* lost in His; in another sense it is only truly found in Him. Of course, we can conceive a mere merging of ourselves into Him which would be an annihilation of all selfhood of our own. But a rational, free, and personal being has always imposed upon him the task of becoming what is at once another than himself, and yet, in the truest sense, himself; that is, what he must become in order to be himself. Jesus Christ is to every man just that other than himself whom it is necessary for him to become in order to realize his selfhood, or become himself. There is no higher act of ourselves, or exercise of our personality, than in becoming and being no longer ourselves, but Christ; for Christ is the truth and the fulfilment of every man. And this fulfilment of Christ in us, and of us in Him, so far from involving any loss of His personality in ours or ours in Him, is the result of the union of us with Him as distinct persons. It is the result of a συμπαθεῖν, in which all that He suffered is made ours, and all that we suffer is His.

What has been said may be restated a little more

exactly, as follows: The high priesthood of Jesus Christ consists in His being, in His humanity, 1st, *Son of Man*, *i.e.* essential manhood; 2d, *Son of God*, *i.e.* man in the fulfilment and perfection of his divine relations, or of the self-realization of God in him; and 3d, as a condition of the above, or "the way" into Sonship, the perfect *sacrifice*, the death in us of all, and the death of us to all, that separates human life from God.

The function or exercise of the high priesthood is, 1st, to Godward, and 2d, to manward. To God He represents man, and *is* man, in all that constitutes for him a real coming, or being brought, to God. In Him every man *has*, potentially as well as representatively, come to God. That is, every man has in Him died to all separation from, and is made alive in all oneness with, God. But that He should be all this to God depends upon His ability to be what, on the other hand, He is to man. Unless He is able to be in every man what He is in Himself, how can He in that represent and be surety to God for every man? His function, then, to manward, is to become to every man —objectively *to* his faith, and subjectively *through* his faith — *his*, *the man's*, death, resurrection, and eternal life. But Christ's thus becoming, as it were, every man, is not at the loss of his own personality in the man's, or of the man's in Him. The unity is not at the cost of the duality, or of the distinction. It is not so in any real personal union. The ideal of the union of husband and wife is not that one should become a nonentity; but that both should retain their personalities in a perfectly free union of minds, wills,

and lives. Individuality may be lost, but personality is heightened by such a union; and it cannot be heightened otherwise than by union and communion with other personalities. Aristotle already shows how, in true friendship, — of which true marriage is the highest earthly form, and our union with Christ is the highest heavenly realization, — the end and effect is to more than double the personal life of each, since each lives in, and is lived in by, the other.

So Christianity is not merely Christ's becoming us, or we Him, but it is a personal relation between Him and us, as separate persons, by which He impresses Himself upon, and imparts Himself to, us, through the mutual love, the union and communion, of Him and us. And so it is that the Epistle to the Hebrews makes so much of our Lord's High Priestly function to usward to consist in the exercise of His divine-human *sympathy*. He is our High Priest not only in what He represents and is to God for us; as our accomplished atonement, redemption, and life; in the fact that He has, in His own human person, opened the way into the Holy of Holies with His blood, and is present with God for us, as surety for our appearance through Him and with Him. But He is so in the sense that He is also Himself personally present *with us*, infinitely nearer than though He were still present in the flesh, by a perfect sympathy to be Himself in all *our* deaths and resurrections, even as by the grace of God we were in His, and to impart to us the grace of His.

It is only as He is outside and beside us, that He is truly in us. Just as in a yet larger truth, it is

only a transcendent God, a God who is *other* to us, and not a merely immanent God, a God who is identical with us, who can be one with us in all the fulness of a spiritual and moral, as well as a natural, oneness. Such a oneness can only be where there is a distinction of persons.

In accepting Jesus Christ, then, as our High Priest, we perform the following acts: In the first place, we recognize in Him the revelation to us of ourselves, but of ourselves not as we are, but as we shall be when we have truly become ourselves. In the second place, and as the condition of the above, we see in Him all our relations with God realized and fulfilled in a perfect holiness, righteousness, and divine-human life. In the third place, and again as a condition of the preceding, we accept the full meaning and results of what is called the perfect sacrifice of our Lord upon the cross. By which we mean that He as man was crucified in, and Himself crucified, all that which in man separates him from God, or stands in the way of the perfect living of God in him, and of him in God. Finally, we recognize and accept in Jesus Christ, not only one who was and did all the above as an individual man, but who is able to become the personal manhood of *every* man. To each one of us, and into each one of us, He personally brings the full meaning, spirit, power, and realization of all that He has Himself done and become. In each of us He re-enacts His whole incarnation, saving work, and heavenly exaltation. He so identifies Himself with us, and us with Himself, that, in His grace and our answering faith, all

that is true of Him is true of us. In Him *we* are dead, risen, ascended, completed, blessed with *all* spiritual blessings in the heavenly places. Objectively, all this is true of us *already;* as subjectively it *shall be* all true in us.

These facts of every distinctively Christian consciousness appear under different representations in all the epistles of the New Testament. In the Epistle to the Hebrews they are expressed under the figures of the Old Testament High Priesthood and Sacrifice. Let us run rapidly over the argument of the epistle.

To begin with (Heb. 1:2), the *Son* in whom God in the final dispensation has revealed Himself is He in whom the Kosmos and the Church are to attain their destination. Just as Adam was the heir (κληρονόμος) of the natural order, so Christ is that of the spiritual and moral order, in which also the natural is to be taken up and completed. In this connection (ch. 2:10) the intimation is given that τελείωσις will involve ἀπολύτρωσις; human completion can take place only through human redemption. It is necessary that God in bringing many sons to glory shall perfect (τελειῶσαι) the captain of their Salvation *through sufferings.* The necessity lies in the fact that human perfection and completion can only be accomplished through suffering; *i.e.* through the definite suffering of that πάθειν σαρκί (suffering or dying *in the flesh*), which, according to St. Peter, is the condition of all human freedom from sin.

The work of Christ is, then (chs. 3 and 4), described under the figure of a second and greater

Joshua (ch. 4 : 8), bringing His people into their *rest*. The lesson deduced here is that of *faith*, through failure of which the temporal Israel failed of its rest in the promised land, and by means of which alone *we* shall enter into the true rest, the promise of which still remains. "We are partakers of and with Christ, we share the victory and rest into which He has entered, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." That is, Jesus Christ as man has attained, represents, and *is* the spiritual, moral, and natural end or destination, the *rest*, of humanity. In faith we *have* attained it in Him, and through faith we *shall* attain it in Him.

From this figure the epistle passes on (in chs. 5–10) to that which is distinctively its theme; viz. Salvation described under the symbolism of the Tabernacle Worship, High Priesthood, and Sacrifice. The great question of all religion and worship is *relation to God*. The Tabernacle symbolized both the fact of separation from God or sin, and the opening of access to God through atonement. The πρώτη σκηνή, or front Tabernacle, in which the daily or ordinary worship was performed, represented that relative and possible service which the people were able to offer, and which God temporarily accepted. The δευτέρα σκηνή — inner Tabernacle, or Holy of Holies — which remained always impenetrably veiled, even the annual entrance into which, by the High Priest, only served to emphasize the fact that the way into it was not yet opened, represented the absolute and as yet impossible service (the perfect relation to God), for which God was preparing His people and which, in

the very nature of things, it was alone possible for Him finally and permanently to accept. There can be no real and effectual religion which does not provide an effectual, real, and complete putting away of sin, or separation, and a consequent and equally real bringing into oneness with God, or atonement. All religion means this, and the divine and absolute religion must effect and be this. The time of the *πρώτη σκηνή*, and of its provisional and temporary worship and service, God put up with, not because it was acceptable and satisfactory in itself, but merely as a stage of preparation and training for that which should be so. It was, in fact, a temporary compromise on God's part, an accommodation to the ignorance and weakness of those who were not ready to receive anything more or better. The compromise consisted in the fact that on God's side it was a mere forbearance, or *ἀνοχή*, a putting up with what was not yet ready to be removed; and for man it was a *πάρεσις*, or passing over, and not a real *ἄφεσις*, or putting away, of his sin (Rom. 3:25, etc.). The very Old Testament expression of *covering up* sin, putting it only out of sight and not out of existence, is a part of a covenant of compromise and accommodation. Such an incomplete and imperfect *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* needed explanation and justification, and it found this only in the bringing in of the complete and perfect *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* of the gospel in which God appears at last as absolutely *ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ὁ δικαιῶν*; that is, not only as perfectly righteous Himself, but as the perfect righteousness of man, the effectual taker away of sin and conferrer of holiness, righteousness, and life.

Throughout the time, then, of the πρώτη σκηνή, the veil remains before the Holy of Holies. The entrance through it of the High Priest once a year only accentuates the fact that it is still unremoved, and symbolizes the act by which alone it should be removed. What that act was to be was taught as plainly as signs could teach it. The High Priest could enter only with *blood*. Only through death can man come to God; there is no covenant between Him and us save that which is contracted ἐπὶ νεκροῖς, over our dead selves (Heb. 9:16 and 17; Ps. 50:5). All that is to be done by us in the way of sacrifice as the condition of access to and into God; all that is involved in a perfect death for and to sin, and the consequent removal of the only separation between us and God, has been accomplished by our great High Priest. He represents man, therefore, as perfected in all his relations with God. He is the author and finisher of our faith; He is an anchor to us within the veil; He is our forerunner into the presence and favor and fellowship of God; and the way by which He entered He has opened and consecrated for us.

But the function of the High Priest is not finished and closed with the fact of His having Himself opened the way, and entered into the Holy of Holies. Having fulfilled all the conditions of becoming our High Priest, by His perfect humanity, His perfect temptation, His perfect sacrifice, and His perfect entrance, He now ever liveth to discharge the functions of His high priesthood. These are, as has been said, in part to Godward and in part to usward. To God He presents in Himself — in what He has done and

is, and in what He is able to be to us — a basis, a sufficient basis, and the only possible basis, for an absolute and final covenant relation between God and man. For He is able to be to God our all-sufficient security for all that is needed for such a covenant relation — our death to sin and self, and our life to Him. In the covenant based upon Him there is no compromise with, or accommodation to, any imperfection or shortcoming on our part. Any such compromise or accommodation is impossible alike for God and for us; for as He can demand nothing less, so can we be saved with nothing less, than the perfect removal of all separation from, and the consummation of a perfect and real union and oneness with, Him.

And as He ever lives to God for us, so He ever lives to us from God. It is not the abstract truth or the impersonal spirit of a dead or an absent Saviour with which we have to do. His truth to us and His spirit in us is always His living and present Self. *God* is never abstract, impersonal, or absent. The righteousness of God in us, or the life of God in us, is God Himself, our righteousness and our life. In Christ, God Himself personally stands at the door of our minds, our hearts, our wills, and our lives, and knocks for entrance into us and oneness with us. The Word, by the Holy Ghost, seeks to incarnate Himself personally in our own personal holiness, righteousness, and life; not to displace us by Himself, but to take us into a perfect personal union with Himself, that we may be in Him and He in us. A man may impress his truth upon another and impart

his spirit to another, and our Lord brings to bear upon us the full force of natural example and of spiritual influence. But we fall infinitely short of a true conception of all that He is if we make His example only the memory and the image to us of what He was, and His influence a mere natural enthusiasm of emulation and imitation, instead of realizing that He Himself, personally present with each of us, seeks to become in each all that as man He is in Himself. As to God, so to every man, He is — in what He is Himself, and in what He is able to be in us — sufficient security for, and absolute assurance of, his own divine Salvation and eternal life.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THIRD.

OF SALVATION IN THE CHURCH.

WHAT strikes one most in the New Testament is the entire good faith with which it holds and proclaims its gospel of Salvation. Jesus Christ there is no mere symbol of Salvation, but a most real, effectual, and actual Salvation to every one who believes. He not only Himself died, but is able to impart to others the power and the fact of His death; He not only lives, but He is able to take us into the fellowship and reality of His own risen life. This power over all flesh to give life to as many as will receive Him, He embodied in the sacrament of baptism. Baptism is the expression of two facts. 1st, the power of Jesus Christ to take us up into the element of His own divine-human life; and 2d, the effect of this union with Him in the death in us of what we call the flesh, and the life in us of what we call the spirit. This *power* is the one point of all John the Baptist's testimony to Jesus. He was to be the baptizer with the Holy Ghost; *i.e.* not only with the sign, but with the power and the reality of all that baptism signifies. What baptism signifies is participation in the death and in the life of Jesus Christ. And in the New

Testament, baptism is just as little a mere symbol as Jesus Christ Himself is. As Christ is not an idea but a fact; God realized in man, and man in God; man dead to self and sin, and alive to God; so baptism is actually all that it signifies, — Christ in the individual man, and the man in Christ; and in Christ dead to sin, and alive to God. The same might be said of all the essential ordinances of the Church; but it will be sufficient to illustrate the fact by this one, and easy to apply it to the others when we have done so. If this *power* of Christ in the Church is no longer a fact, may it not be because we no longer *discern* it?

Passing by, for the present, our Lord's own institution of baptism into the Trinity as the avowed expression and exercise of His saving and life-giving *power*, — "All power is given Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, *therefore*, and . . . baptize; and lo, I am with you to the end of the world," — I will, by two or three passages only, out of many, illustrate the place assigned to it without question in the New Testament.

To the very first question ever asked in the history of the Christian Church as to the way of Salvation through Christ, St. Peter replied, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, unto, or for, the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Baptism gives *effect* to repentance; it is God in Christ putting away the sin which the man in himself desires, but is impotent, to put away. To say, "Repent and be baptized," is equivalent to saying, "Desire to

be free from sin and come to God in Christ, to find the only possible freedom from it." Into the word μετανοήσατε, which we translate "repent," if we make it include effectual repentance, or repentance completed by baptism with the spirit and power of Christ, it is quite possible and proper to read the whole of the spiritual and moral change, or new creation, which Jesus Christ Himself is, and which baptism in its completeness not only means but *is* in us. The mental and moral after-mind, or new mind, which evidences the death of the old man and the life of the new, this the baptism of John could indeed *mean*, and express the need and necessity for; but it could not *be* or effect it. This difference between a mere sign and the reality of the thing signified is just that which John the Baptist sees between his own baptism and that of Jesus. "I baptize you with water, with the symbol only; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and therefore with the realization in you of the thing symbolized." The symbol by itself *signified* all the truth of the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. With the Holy Ghost it not only *signifies*, but it *is*, always *potentiâ*, and wherever and just so far as it is realized by faith, *actu*, the death in us of that which died in Christ, and the life in us of that which lives in Him.

The distinction between what might be called Old and New Testament baptism might be extended further. In the Old Testament *sacrifice*, *e.g.* there was a great deal *meant* which those sacrifices were unable to *be* or to *effect*. Just because the sacrifice could *not* be or effect what it meant, it was accepted

as though it were and did so. The offerer was accepted *as though* with the victim he had died for his sin, and so were himself dead to and from sin, although in fact he was not so. So the Old Testament notion of acceptance through another's death, which is distinctly *not* one's own, but a substitute for or instead of it, arose, and was right enough in its place as an Old Testament notion. But when it is brought forward into Christianity as a New Testament truth, it is a direct contradiction of the very distinction between the Old and the New Testaments. The Old Testament sacrifice *was* a life instead of a life, the life of the victim only signifying that of the offerer, and accepted *instead of* it, just because of its inability to *be* it. But because Jesus Christ is able to become every man by taking every man up into Himself, because as many of us as are baptized into Christ do put on Christ; that is, because He is able as for Himself, so for every man, and in every man, to be the actual and real death of his flesh and life of his spirit, therefore the sacrifice of Jesus Christ differs from those of the Old Testament *just in this*, that it is *not merely* representative, or substitutionary, or vicarious.

Now what I have called the reality, as distinguished from the mere significance, of baptism, is a truth necessary to supplement that of the real distinction between our Lord's sacrifice and those of the Old Testament. For the power of His death to atone, to redeem, and to save depends upon just that which is the truth of baptism; viz. the possibility of such a real relation between Jesus Christ and our-

selves as that He can become *we*, and we *He;* His death our death, and His life our life. And I say that in the New Testament the truth that baptism constitutes such a real relation between Jesus Christ and us, and between His death and resurrection and ours, is as vital a part of our Salvation as that Jesus Christ Himself was what He was, and suffered and did what He did. To have arrested the saving act or process of God in Christ at the moment, say, of His own ascension, and before the ascended Lord had descended in His baptism with the Holy Ghost to become *our* Salvation, would have been to interpose between cause and effect, and frustrate the whole "Because I live ye shall live also." Of what avail is it to me that Jesus Christ has united Godhead and manhood if He has not united God and me? That He is the death of humanity to sin and its life to God in His own person, if He is not my death and life? It is that I am in Him, and in Him potentially and effectually dead to sin and alive to God; and that His death and resurrection do *not* only represent mine, but *are* mine; which constitutes Him my Saviour and my Salvation. He is my Salvation in that He is not only for me, but in me, that than which there is no other salvation possible for me. He is my Saviour in that Salvation is no impersonal or abstract thing from God, but God Himself in me, the Eternal Divine Logos in whose image I am, and who as my ideal self realizes Himself in my actual self.

But to return to the words of St. Peter. When he says, Be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, the full force of the baptism in or into

that name is not felt until we realize the reality and completeness of the personal union and oneness with Christ into which baptism is designed and is effectual to bring us. A union so real and so complete as to constitute a veritable regeneration, or death in one nature and life and birth into another. If men realized baptism as the New Testament does; if they felt that the act by which Jesus Christ incarnates Himself in each man is as truly a divine act as that by which the Eternal Logos took flesh in *Him* ("As Thou Father in me *so* I in them"); if indeed they regarded baptism as but one act in the process of that Incarnation in which the Eternal Word fulfils Himself not only in the head, but in the whole body which is His πλήρωμα or fulness, they would understand much better the place which the New Testament assigns to baptism and to the Church in the working of our Salvation.

"To be baptized into Christ"; "to put on Christ by baptism"; "to be in Christ by baptism"; being in Christ to be all we are and do all we do "in His name"; *i.e.* in the full consciousness and realization of our oneness with Him; in Him to put off in thought and in act all that we were and put on all that He is; to be able in Him to do and to suffer all things; and to feel that God and all things are ours — these and similar expressions in the New Testament mean something. And to all of us they *are* just so much of their meaning as we *receive*. To whom they mean little, they are little; to whom they mean all that they are, they *are* all that they mean. "*Believe* that you have, and you *have*." Not that the

merely believing *causes* us to have, but we really *have* if only we will believe. There is no limit to what we have in Christ but our own inability to believe and receive.

So when St. Peter goes on to say, Be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for, or unto, the remission of your sins, εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτίων ὑμῶν, the force of the εἰς is complete and final — *unto* the very end and consummation of the whole meaning of μετάνοια; to the complete putting away of the sin of the flesh because to the putting off in Christ of the flesh of sin. The divine ἄφεσις in Jesus Christ includes indeed all such partial truths as pardon, forgiveness, present acceptance, etc., but it means, and it *is*, the actual and the absolute putting away of all sin, and of all that belongs to or is connected in any way with sin.

If one should think that this is taking baptism too literally, let him for a moment consider how St. Paul takes it. In Rom. 6 the objection is met that if we make our Salvation in Christ so purely an act of divine grace, there is nothing left for *us* to do; "let us continue in sin that grace may abound." St. Paul's reply covers two points. How *can* we continue in sin if grace abounds, when grace can only abound in our sinlessness, *i.e.* in our death to sin and life to holiness? It is evident that the Apostle has no other conception of grace than the gift of God to us in Christ, which is participation in His death and in His life. Grace can be viewed as objectively existing in Christ *only* as we see in Christ the potency and foresee in Him the certainty of our becoming

what He is. To couple His grace, therefore, with the possibility of our continuing in sin is a contradiction of the meaning of grace. But in the second place what I call special attention to in St. Paul's reply is *this:* that the very meaning and reality of grace in the Apostle's mind is involved in the truth and reality of baptism. What makes Jesus Christ in such sense potentially every man, and actually every man who believes, that His death and resurrection are those of every man, is the fact of baptism. If there were no such word and no such rite in existence the fact would still remain that unless Jesus Christ can so take us into union with His person as to make us actual participants in His death and resurrection, His own death and resurrection would have no saving significance or efficiency for us. This fact, which is an essential and indispensable link in the chain of saving grace, is in the New Testament not only expressed by but inseparably associated and identified with baptism. "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" How *can* we? "We who died to sin, how can we continue to live in it? Or are ye ignorant of the fact that we *have* died to sin; that so many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death? We were buried with Him by baptism into death that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life." It is baptism by which the Incarnation and all it includes is extended to and made to include us. I say all that it includes, for the Incarnation in our Lord Himself was completed only in His ascension, when the Eternal Logos

was, through His perfect human faith, obedience, and self-sacrifice, fully entered into and contained in His perfected human personality. The Incarnation involved for its consummation in Him His death σαρκί, and resurrection πνεύματι. And when He takes us up by baptism and includes us in the still continuing process of His self-incarnation, He takes us into the fellowship of His still operative death and resurrection.

It makes no difference whether in this sixth chapter of Romans St. Paul means that we are already in fact or as yet only in faith dead, etc., in Christ. Faith is only anticipated fact, and fact is only realized faith. The *truth* of Jesus Christ is our actual death and life in and with Him, whether we look at it as accomplished in Him or as to be accomplished in us; whether as already appropriated by us in present faith, or as to be realized in us in a future consummation in fact. And let us remind ourselves that in this chapter it is distinctly stated that as we are to die Christ's death, so He died the death which we must die in order to be saved. His death was a death of our old man, or flesh of sin, and so a death on His part to sin. With this *sole* difference, that the old man whom He crucified was the result of all other men's but not His own sinning, and so the sin to which He died was not His own sin, and would only have become His by His *not* dying to it.

It is not St. Paul alone who, in the epistles of the New Testament, takes this view of the *reality* of baptism and the relation in which it brings us to Christ and His saving grace. St. Peter (1 Epistle

3:21) speaks of baptism as saving us, not by the putting away of the filth of the flesh (not as though it were mere *water*), but by its power to cleanse the conscience or consciousness of guilt and sin, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ"; *i.e.* by bringing us into union with Him who is dead and in whom we are dead to these and alive from them.

And if St. John in his First Epistle does not mention the word baptism, the *thing* is none the less the theme from beginning to end. That we are, in Christ, born anew, and as such dead to sin and alive in the fellowship of the divine life and nature, is the subject of the epistle.

When one reflects upon the above, which I believe truly to reflect the mind of the New Testament, the only conclusion, it seems to me, which can combine the entire teaching in one system of truth is the following: The end and purpose of the Incarnation is to be judged of only by taking it in its full sweep and final consummation. It is the fulfilment of the eternal divine mind, or Logos, in *man*, and in the kosmos, with man as its head. What man in Adam was to the natural creation, that man in Christ is, or is to be, to the spiritual and moral creation. But Adam was not one man, and Christ is not one man. There must have been one man in whom the natural order originated, and there must have been one man in whom the spiritual order originated; but, in their several ways, both Adam and Christ are the whole orders of which they are the respective heads. Adam is the *natural* man, and his *nature* is reproduced and reappears in every man born of him. Christ is the

spiritual man, and His *spirit* is reproduced and reappears in every man who is born of Him. The distinction is just as important as the resemblance or analogy between the two. Adam is born, and is in us, in our impersonal nature; Christ is born, and is in us, in our personal spirits. Adam is in us as an impersonal fact; Christ is in us only by a personal act. It is only Adam's nature that is born and is in us; it is Christ Himself who is born and is in us.

If the Divine Word thus incarnated Himself in Jesus Christ as only the ἀρχή, or beginning, of His self-incarnation in man, or humanity, the Incarnation does not end, but only begins, in Jesus Christ viewed as an individual. And so really it is represented and intended in the New Testament. The real ἔργον of our Lord seems but ready to begin on that famous Pentecost when Christian baptism began. All before that was but preparation; the life was preparing and perfecting itself, which was now to begin to live in man. The result of this self-preparation was expressed by our Lord when He collected His apostles together to receive His last instructions and witness His ascension: "All power is given Me in heaven and upon earth" — power to raise humanity up to God, power to impart the risen humanity to men, power to give life to as many as should be baptized into Him — "Go ye therefore and baptize all nations." Carry the Divine Life which I am, and bring all men into fellowship with it. Make all men in Me partakers of the spirit, the nature, the life of God. "And lo, *I* am with you alway." Our Lord had no conception that His pres-

ence and His operation were to cease upon earth in consequence of His absence in the flesh. On the contrary, His presence, *πνεύματι*, only began with His absence, *σαρκί*. St. Paul judges thus: That if one died for all, then all died; and He died for all that all should be alive, no longer to themselves, but to Him. So that we know no longer any one *κατὰ σάρκα*; not Christ Himself, nor any one in Christ. If any one is in Christ, he is *καινὴ κτίσις*; he is, with Christ, *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*. The old things are passed away, and new things have taken their place. St. Paul knows no longer Christ *κατὰ σάρκα*, for Christ is Himself dead *σαρκί*, but he knows Him *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, as not only Himself alive in the spirit, but the life in the spirit of every one in whom He lives, *i.e.* as *πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν*. Our Lord had Himself said that the Father had given to Him, as His specific *ἔργον*, not only "to have life in Himself," but *ζωοποιεῖν*, to *give* life, to *be* the resurrection and the life of *men*. It was given to Him, not only to have life *in Himself* as being Himself humanity made alive, but to be able to impart His life *to humanity*, which should be made alive in Him. Adam, in whom we all sin and die, is *ὁ σαρκικός*, man under the power of his fallen nature. Christ, in whom we are all made alive, is *ὁ πνευματικός*, man who has recovered his spiritual and personal supremacy over his flesh, a supremacy which is really recovered and wholly recovered in the crucifixion, death, and burial of that in us, only the *not* crucifying of which in us is sin, and the crucifying of which is our only holiness.

Now just as we say that Jesus Christ is not only ὁ ἅγιος, but ὁ ἁγιάζων; not only ὁ δίκαιος, but ὁ δικαιῶν; not only ὁ τελειωθείς, but ὁ τελειῶν; so He is not only ὁ ζῶν πνεύματι, but ὁ ζωοποιῶν πνεύματι. And He is not only our life-giver, but our life. He is the true personality and personal life of every person; the true selfhood of every self; the true manhood of every man. Every man only truly becomes himself in becoming Christ; and every man who becomes Christ does so by a personal act of Christ as well as of himself. It is both *himself* conforming his actual to his ideal self, and it is his eternal, divine, and personal ideal transforming him into Himself; for it is only as Christ incarnates Himself in us that we can incarnate Him; and it is only as we incarnate Him that He can incarnate Himself in us.

When it is said in the creed that the Holy Ghost is the life-giver, it is in the following distinct and definite sense: Jesus Christ is Himself personally our life; but He is so objectively, only as He is to be so subjectively. And Christ can be personally *in us*, as our subjective life, only by the Holy Ghost in us as the principle and power of *our own* personal appropriation and reproduction of Him. The Holy Ghost prepares the *spiritual man* for *spiritual things;* He manifests Himself in *our* power to receive and to live Christ; His is the power by which our Lord enables all who believe in Him to become children of God. The presence of our Lord in the Church, and in its individual members, is a *spiritual* one, not only as He is Himself present κατὰ πνεῦμα, and not κατὰ

σάρκα ; but in that *we* can only know and have Him with us, as we are ourselves in the spirit and not in the flesh. "The world shall not *know*, but *ye* shall know; for the Holy Ghost shall be in you." It should be the function of the Holy Ghost to show and to impart Christ to us, *i.e.* to mediate His *spiritual* presence among and in us.

Assuming, as I think we must, that the Incarnation in the totality of its meaning and purpose is to be seen not in Christ as an individual man, but in Christ as spiritual humanity, or humanity as it is to become spiritual in Him, we cannot call the Incarnation *completed* even in our Lord's own ascension. It was completed in *Him*, but not yet begun in *us*. As the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it, we see Christ *as a man*, but we see not yet Christ *as man τετελειωμένον*. *A man*, it is true, able to become all men, and destined to become all who should receive Him, but as yet containing in Himself alone the *πλήρωμα* of divine life and Salvation with which he was to fill the whole Church. It was God's purpose to lead many sons to glory, but as yet "the Captain" only of this Salvation was made perfect. In the love of God He was but the means, *they* were the end; and assuredly God's self-incarnation was not completed in Him *without them.* The corn of wheat was planted and sprung up, but *why* the planting and the springing up except that it should "bear much fruit" through the multiplication of itself in others? And so again in 1 Cor. 15. While as *a man* we see Christ exalted above all, and all enemies, including death, put under His feet, yet as *man*, and in His

relation as Head to *all* humanity, He is still reigning until sin and death are abolished and all enemies *shall be* put under His feet. So the Incarnation was not completed in our Lord's individual ascension; it was but ready to *begin*. "He that ascended must descend and fill all things." He who was absent in His individual body must be spiritually and personally present in the Church which is His body — the fulness of Him who filleth all in all. "Lo, I am with you always, and the acts you perform in My name *I* perform. He who receives you receives Me, and he that rejects you rejects Me." And so St. Paul, *e.g.* performs every such act with this conviction and feeling, "As though God in Christ did by me." *As though*, not in the sense that God does *not*, but that He *does* by us all that we do in Christ's name.

It seems to me, therefore, that every true baptism is an integral part of the divine act or process of incarnation. As the Logos was conceived and born in the womb of the Virgin, so is the Incarnate Word by the incarnating Spirit to be conceived and born in the faith, obedience, and personal life of every individual man. "Be baptized, each one of you"; be every individual man taken into Christ, and into a real and effectual participation in His death to sin and His life to God. To every man his own baptismal day is at once a true Christmas day and a true birthday, the day of the birth of Christ in him and of his own birth in Christ. And if more blessed is he who hears and receives the Word, in whose personal faith and obedience and life Christ is born and lives, than she whose only physical womb gave birth and

human life to the Incarnate Word, then those spiritual Christmases many are not to be despised in comparison with that one great physical Christmas which all the world commemorates. Not, indeed, that the birth of the Virgin *was* only a physical birth; but *in so far as it was* that only, it was less than the least spiritual birth of Christ into the personal and spiritual life of man.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOURTH.

OF BAPTISM.

The question will, of course, at once present itself to us, whether Christian baptism practically sustains, or can be made to sustain, the dignity and character attributed to it in the preceding chapter. The act of baptism is there, if not put on a par, yet brought into very close comparison with the act by which the Word took flesh. They are held to be both acts of the same Divine Person; only, in one case it is the Word becoming man, and in the other it is the Word as man entering into and becoming the manhood and personal life of individual men. Both are not only acts of one person, but they are parts of the one process of His Incarnation viewed as a whole.

If it be said that this is an impossible place and part to assign to baptism, I ask, Why so? It is the position of the New Testament and of the Church in the beginning. Is not the seeming impossibility of its being so regarded *now* a consequence of the loss of the sense of our Lord's real spiritual presence in His Church, and of the work of His Incarnation still going on in the world? Baptism is able to be just what *we* are able to make, or to receive, it. If to us

all the Church were the body of our Lord's living and personal presence, and self-incarnating power and operation, His baptism would be to us as *real* as Himself. We would believe that, *as* God is in Him, *so* is He by baptism in us. We cannot so receive baptism, because we see that, as a matter of fact, baptism falls so far short of this. I question whether there is any greater discrepancy between the divine meaning and the outward seeming of an act of baptism than there was between the divine reality and the human appearance of that Virgin Birth which gave life to the world. But if we think so little of baptism because there *is* so little in it, is it not possible that there is so little in it because we think so little of it? If we could but see in it all that it is, it would be to us all that it is. The difficulty lies behind it in our conception of the Church, and yet behind that in our conception of the Incarnation and of our Lord Himself. Jesus Christ is God in the whole process of cosmic and human redemption and completion. He is the incarnation of God in the whole history and destiny of the κτίσις. As all things began, so all things end, in Him who is at once their final and their efficient cause. The Incarnation has been in progress from the beginning, and will be to the end of things. Jesus Christ was objectively and individually incarnate as a man only as a means and a step to His subjective and generic incarnation as man. His Incarnation is as truly and as really in process and progress in the Church as it was in Him. Nay, rather, the Church is as truly *He* as the body of flesh in which He was visibly present on earth;

and its baptisms are as really His births into individual men as His birth of the Virgin was a real birth into humanity. The majority of men — all but the very fewest, and they very uncertainly and unstably — saw no more of God in Jesus Christ than men see now in the Church and its acts. To most, to almost all, of those to whom He came in the flesh, He came as ineffectually, as practically *not at all*, as He comes now in the Church and its ordinances. The kingdom of God, now, as at the beginning and always, cometh not with observation. Except a man be born from above, he cannot *see it*.

Every Christian baptism is, then, at least in its divine intention and meaning, as much the personal act of Jesus Christ as the Virgin birth was the act of the Divine Word. In both cases it is by the Holy Ghost. That is, as the personal Word incarnated Himself in the human subjective dispositions, in the faith, obedience, and personal human life of the man He became, all of which was the work of the Holy Ghost in the man Christ Jesus: so Jesus Christ can be born and reproduce Himself and live in us only through the operation in us of the Holy Ghost, through those subjective dispositions of faith, etc., which it is His function to produce, and through which we know and receive and reproduce Christ. If the office of the Holy Ghost is thus *aptare hominem Deo*, in the case of Jesus Christ Himself the manhood was fitted to the Godhead with an infallible completeness and perfection. The human conditions in Him were as complete as the divine activity which incarnated itself through them. The Incarnation, there-

fore, was perfectly realized in Him. That Jesus Christ does not through every baptism reproduce Himself as perfectly in every baptized person as the Logos incarnated Himself in Him, is not because He is not as much in every baptism for that purpose, but because of the imperfection of the human conditions for receiving and reproducing Him. For, however completely God gives Himself, man only perfectly receives Him in a perfect faith, a perfect obedience, and a perfect life. All I claim is that Jesus Christ wholly and really *gives* Himself in every baptism, not that He is wholly *received* in any, nor at all in many. But in any, the failure or limitation of the reception is in the human conditions, and not in the divine gift.

But what baptism truly means and is ought to be studied in its ideal and not in its actual character and effects. Suppose the case, then, of a church which knows itself as the body of Jesus Christ, and which performs all its acts in His name as though Christ Himself performed them through it. And suppose the baptism given by such a church *received* in a faith as real and as living. The supposition of an ideally complete faith on both sides is, no doubt, a practical impossibility. Then, of course, the regeneration wrought, viewed as a subjective reproduction of Christ, will be correspondingly incomplete. But certainly the faith, both of the church and of the personal subjects of its baptism, might be indefinitely more perfect than it is, and if it *were* complete, then the new life actually imparted through it *would be* complete also. In a condition of things where the

Church does not know itself as Christ's body, the organ of His presence and His operation, and consequently does not perform its acts as *His* acts; where by further consequence its acts are not received as from Christ Himself, and there is an absence of that faith through which alone divine grace is able to work, — under such conditions, I say, how can we expect that our actual baptism shall sustain and justify such an ideal character as we have given it?

The only way to understand and receive the New Testament conception of the divine meaning and efficacy of baptism is to see in it wholly a *divine* act complete in itself, but to be completed in us only as we receive it. To every baptized person Jesus Christ is wholly given in all His death to sin and in all His life to God. That divine act constitutes our *regeneration.* Baptism is the instrument of "adoption and grace," whereby we are "made children of God." In regeneration, faith is simply receptive, it is not creative. A man is regenerated *through* not *by* his faith. His regeneration is Christ in him, in the power and reality of His death to sin and His life to God. Neither, consequently, is a man regenerated by the historical death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, but only by a present Christ in him in the present and abiding power of His death and resurrection.

There are these three things, in their order, necessary to a man's completed regeneration. 1st, That Christ should have died and risen, and should *be* the resurrection and the life. 2d, That Christ should come to the man and be to him the power of his

death and resurrection. This is Christ's act, not the man's, and is the efficient cause of his regeneration. 3d, That the man should through faith, or in faith, receive and realize, or subjectively actualize, this act of Christ.

When does Christ's coming to me as my regeneration take place? Is it in the very act and fact of my faith, neither before nor after but *in it*, in the sense that the faith itself constitutes and is my regeneration? Or, secondly, is it in an act of *Christ's* to be distinguished from *my* act of faith, but coming after and conditioned upon my faith, in the sense that my faith must *precede* and *bring* Christ's act of grace? I believe it is neither of these. With the second I believe that I am regenerated not by my act of faith, but by Christ's act of baptism, and that these two ought to be distinguished. But I believe that the logical order is that the divine act of adoption and grace should go before and produce my faith, and not that my faith should go before and produce the divine act of adoption and grace. The function of faith is not to cause but to accept and receive regeneration. "Because we *are* sons, God sends forth the spirit of His Son in our hearts, crying Abba Father." Because Christ's act has made us sons prior to any act on our part, even our faith; God, through our faith coming after and accepting the grace of God and the fact of our sonship, sheds abroad in our hearts the spirit of His Son and of sons. We love Him because He loved us, not *vice versa*. The fact of sonship precedes and produces the affection of sons, not the affection the fact.

"We are all sons of God, by faith, in Jesus Christ." These words might grammatically be read either way, but I have ventured to show by the punctuation what is the true analysis and order of the thought. We are, *in Christ* (*i.e.* by baptism into Him, as the objective, efficient, divine *cause* of the relationship), sons of God, through faith (as the subjective human *condition* or *mean*). This interpretation is proved by the very next sentence: "*For* as many of us as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." We were by God's act of grace baptized into Christ's death, or the putting off of the flesh and ourselves, and into Christ's resurrection, or the putting on of His relation and spirit of Sonship, *i.e.* of Himself. Baptism is something done *to us* and not something done *by us*. God's act of love precedes always our act of faith, which simply receives what God has given and realizes what God has *made* us.

Of course there is a faith prior to baptism without which no man would come to it, but no more such faith can be properly required of one coming to baptism than is sufficient to bring him to it, for every human being is unconditionally entitled to the grace of God in Christ which baptism imparts. The function of Christian faith proper *follows* baptism, and consists in the realization, not only in the understanding but in the will and the life, of what is freely given to us in Christ. What is *freely given*, by which is meant *unconditionally given;* for what is given in Christ by baptism is not conditioned upon anything, not even faith. Faith is not the condition of God's giving, but only of our receiving; and it is not a

condition imposed by God, but inherent in the nature of the thing. We cannot receive spiritual things without faith, for faith is our reception of spiritual things. Faith proper, then, presupposes baptism which furnishes to it its object and content. As Luther expresses it in substance, the function of Christian faith is to realize our baptism; it is subjectively appropriating and making good the fact that we *have been* made the sons of God.

The baptism of infants does not mean that they are by the act subjectively or actually, but that they are by the act objectively or potentially regenerated. The former requires faith or reception which cannot yet exist in them; the latter is independent of faith and depends upon grace alone which can be and is present. When the child begins to exercise faith, its proper object, the content with which it ought to find itself filled, is the fact already existing that he *is* — that baptism *has made* him — the child of God in Christ. What the child's faith has to accomplish is not to *make* himself son of God, nor to move God by an act contingent upon it to make him so, but simply to accept, to subjectively realize and make good, the fact that God *has made* him, and that he *is* son of God. The importance of this order of things appears in the Christian nurture of children when the issue arises, as it must necessarily arise, whether they are to be taught that they must believe *in order to become* children of God, as though their faith made them so, or God was waiting on their faith to make them so; or whether, on the contrary, they are to be taught that God, by the unconditional adoption

and grace of baptism, has made them children, and that they by their faith must realize or subjectively fulfil that relation. Our part in Christianity is simply to be what God makes us; and His *making* precedes and is the condition of our *being*, and not the other way. "Behold what manner of love the Father *hath bestowed upon us* that we should be called sons of God, and *we are*." Faith does not create that fact, or bring it about; all it has to do is to accept it and set us to *being* what, by the grace of God, *we are*.

I fully realize the danger of such an unhesitating view of the divine character and effect of Christian baptism. The history of Christianity has fully illustrated it. It has shown that the teaching of any divine *reality* in baptism will lead men to attach a magical and superstitious importance to it, and to trust the mere *opus operatum*. But is the proper remedy for this to go to the opposite extreme of denying it *all* divine significance and virtue? The no less disastrous consequences of which are visible enough in the current Christianity around us. *Let us teach a true, rational, and real Salvation*, a Salvation which means holiness, righteousness, and life; and men will not be in danger of expecting to be saved by magic or superstition. It is quite as possible to attach a magical effect to the imputation to us of another's act for the removal of our guilt and penalty for sin, as it is to attach it to the formula of a christening or the *hocus pocus* of a Mass. What we want is to carry to men by word and sacrament a *real Salvation* not only in all its divine causes, but in

all its human effects. If Salvation is made synonymous with religion, morality, and manhood, men will not be able to satisfy themselves with any sort of a magical, *opere operato*, Salvation.

But to believe that Jesus Christ is God's revelation to us of manhood; that baptism is Christ's gift to us of the spirit and power of His manhood; and that in the grace of that baptism we are enabled and able to realize all the spiritual, moral, and natural potentialities of our own manhood, in a perfect faith, a perfect obedience, and a perfect life — that is neither magic nor superstition. It is Jesus Christ, the wisdom of God and the power of God to us: it is on our part simply taking God at His word, and receiving His gifts in the same good faith in which they are offered. God's acts *are* to us what they mean, just in so far as we *take them* for what they mean.

The world is puzzled by the insistance on the part of the Church upon so literal an interpretation of the proper language of sacraments. As, *e.g.* after baptism, "Seeing now that this person is regenerate"; or, in the other sacrament, "This is my body," etc. And no doubt the mystification is only added to by most explanations given.

The underlying principle seems to me to be this. It is not at all that the language in itself is not capable of a merely figurative, and not literal, signification; or that it would not ordinarily and naturally be understood in that way. "This is my body," it would ordinarily be most reasonable to interpret as meaning, "This signifies or represents my body." But the true instinct and mind of the Church clings,

as it has always done, to the living and operative presence of Christ in His Church, and in those acts of the Church which are specifically His own acts. Sacraments are a divine and not a human language. They are the utterances of the Word Himself as He comes to us in the prosecution of His proper and essential ἔργον in the world. As I have said, the truth of the Incarnation would be to me only an historical fact, an event of eighteen hundred years ago, without the truth of baptism; if He who became incarnate for me stopped, as it were, short of me, and did not become so in me. His personal coming to me thus does not await and is not the result of any act of mine. He comes to me in His Church and through its ordinances. The office of faith is to discern Him in these, and to suffer Him through them to fulfil Himself in me. No man comes to Christ, Christ comes to him to be accepted or rejected of him. To believe in baptism is simply to receive Jesus Christ in the act in which He comes to include us in Himself, and make us a part of His Incarnation — to impart to us in Himself the grace and fact of His death and His life. A true faith will simply receive baptism for what it is; not merely as meaning something, but as being what it means. And baptism precisely signifies and is, what the Gospel of God *must* mean to every human being, his death to sin and his life in God.

Every word of man is a mere sign; it expresses or represents something which in itself it is not. God's words are not "grammatical vocables"; His language is not one of signs, but of things. And

even when He speaks through signs they are never *mere* signs, but always the *things* they signify. His one, only, all-expressive, and all-sufficient Word to us is Jesus Christ — Jesus Christ as He came for us all in His flesh; as He comes to us all in His spirit in His Church; as He takes us into union with Him in baptism, and sustains us in communion with Him in His Supper; as He imparts to us through this union and communion with Himself the power and reality of His own death and resurrection. Whenever He comes to us in the ways of His appointment, it is the part of faith to meet and receive Him *as being there* in all the actuality of His presence and of His operation. If the words which He spoke were spirit and life, how much more is He Himself — the Word — spirit and life, power and reality, wherever He is. Baptism is certainly a sign; but the question is, Whose sign is it? If it is God's and not man's, if it is God's word to us and not man's, then it *is* what it means, it is *the thing* it signifies. If it signifies, if it means, *regeneration*, — a death to sin and a birth and new life to God through the spirit and power of Christ which is able to subdue all things unto itself, — then it *is* regeneration. It is not regeneration subjectively realized and completed in the man himself, but it is regeneration objectively made his own and secured to him in Christ by the fact of his being in Christ. It is *so* his that it will only be not his by his not believing it to be, and his own failure to make it, his own. Jesus Christ Himself, then, put on in baptism, first objectively and potentially in the grace of God and, secondly, subjec-

tively and actually through our faith, is and constitutes our regeneration.

This distinction between a, first, objective relation by baptism and a, secondarily, subjective relation through faith, to Christ as our regeneration, may at first sight seem formal and unnecessary. But then, *how* is one to be subjectively and actually regenerate, *except* through faith in a relation to the source and cause of his regeneration which precedes and is the condition of his being regenerated by it? I only live spiritually through faith in Christ as my life. But it is not faith, but grace, that makes Christ my life, and it is only as grace first makes Him that I can through faith receive Him as my life. The language of faith is simply to say, "Christ *is* my life"; but how can faith say so, unless *He is so?* Baptism, as God's act of my regeneration, must then be true of me before faith, as *my* act of being regenerate, can take place.

The question of regeneration in the act of baptism is merely one of our use of the word regeneration. If we use it in the sense of the subjective personal change which can take place in us only through faith, we cannot place regeneration *in the act* of baptism. If we mean by it the objective *divine* act of our engrafting or incorporation into Christ who is our regeneration, our death to sin and life in God, then it takes place not before or after, but *in* baptism. But if it is the divine intention and institution that through our faith in *God's* taking us into the life in Christ, *we* shall be able to begin to live the life in Christ, then the objective must precede

and be the condition of the subjective regeneration. And to say that not until the subjective change has taken place can the objective relation be entered into is to put the effect before the cause; it is to make faith precede the existence of its object and content. Instead of our exercising the faith and spirit of sons because we *are sons*, it is requiring us to exercise the faith and spirit *in order to become* sons, which is the true order neither of nature nor of grace.

Regeneration in its broadest sense covers and includes the entire process of our predestination and destination in Christ. The resurrection of Jesus Christ was the potential regeneration of the world; baptism into Christ, and into the power and fellowship of his death and resurrection, is the personal, but still only potential, regeneration of each man; faith and the life of faith is his subjective and actual regeneration, but as yet only incomplete and in progress; his own resurrection in the last day is his completed and perfect regeneration in body and soul.

But we live now in faith and hope, and not yet in consummation. And the proper object and content of faith is God's Word. To faith, what God says *is*. What baptism means and says, it should be to us; and if it means regeneration, then to our faith it should *be* regeneration. And if it is so to faith, it will be so in fact, for God's Word depends only upon our faith to become fact in us. At present, then, the *locus*, or place of regeneration, is baptism; for *there*, in the act of God *making* us regenerate, and not in our own act of merely realizing, or actualizing, our

regeneration, do we locate the origin and initiation of our life in Christ.

One cannot but admire the unhesitating and unqualified manner in which the Church, in all its offices, utters the simple and straightforward language of *faith*. The trumpet gives forth no uncertain sound. By baptism we are dead with Christ and risen with Christ, and therefore *regenerate*. The only non-regeneration of one whom God has baptized is his own ignorance, or unbelief, or rejection of the fact that he *is* regenerate. But the Church assumes, or suggests, no such doubt or denial, but puts into his mouth only the language of faith, assurance, and fulfilment. As Christ died and rose, so the baptized person is to call and account himself dead to sin and alive to God. He is to *be* regenerate by believing himself regenerate; he is to realize the fact that he *is* regenerate. God has *made* him so; therefore he must account himself, and *be*, so. And he will only not be so in fact through not being so in faith, *i.e.* through not believing that by God's grace and act he is so.

The Church as a living Church should bring up her children in a living faith to realize their baptism, *i.e.* to make it real by accepting and treating it as real; to *be* children of God by believing that they *are* children of God, and not that they have to make themselves so by any act of theirs. And if we were born of and into such a living Church, our faith would be such a living faith, and our baptism would be, both to us and in us, such a living fact. At any rate, if it were not, the fault and failure would be,

not in it, but in us: not in its not regenerating, but in our rejecting and making naught our regeneration. It would no more make baptism not a divine and a divinely efficacious act, than the fact of our Lord's inability to do His mighty works, on account of men's unbelief, made Him not a divine person.

Recurring to the Church's use of the word regeneration as applied to baptism. We say that a person is made rich, or becomes rich, by the act that *makes* him so, and prior to any use, or even knowledge, on his part of his riches. Now all the fulness and riches of Christ's life is *made ours by baptism*, and not (in the case of baptized infants) by our subsequent knowledge and living of Christ's life. We do not have it by living, we must have it in order to live it. It might be said we *have it*, in this objective sense, in Jesus Christ Himself, and do not need to have it by the additional act of baptism. But we *do not* have it in the mere historic fact of Christ Himself, but only as Christ comes to us one by one, and includes us in Himself, and takes us into the fellowship of His regenerate life. This act of inclusion in Him, baptism represents and is; and faith is simply our subjective recognition and realization of it. Just as in Jesus Christ Himself, it was the Godhead that assumed the manhood, and man entered into God only as God first entered into man, so now our coming to Christ is simply our recognition and acceptance of the act of Christ's coming to us and taking us into union with Himself. As important as it is for us to make the divine act prior to, and the condition of the human in our Lord's personal incar-

nation, so important is it to make the divine act and grace of baptism prior to, and the ground and condition of, the faith through which, subjectively, we receive the *υἱοθεσία*, and become in ourselves sons of God.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIFTH.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

REAL views of the sacraments and a real interpretation of their language are necessarily incomprehensible and absurd to those who have not that conception of the Church, of the Incarnation, and of our Lord Himself which not only justify, but necessitate them. Truth is truth only *in relation*. Taken out of its place and its connection with the system or organic whole of truth, that may be false, and even pernicious, which in its place and connection is reasonable, natural, and necessary. Thus high views of the sacraments merely in and for themselves, arguments for the literal meaning of their language, and claims of supernatural effects *ex opere operato*, disconnected from any rational and spiritual view of where they belong and what they are, very naturally and properly seem to many to reduce them to mere magical and superstitious rites. Such claims, as they are too often held and presented, are false, absurd, and destructive of all true and reasonable religion.

But the great truth that the incarnation of God in man is still going on in this world, and will not be completed until Jesus Christ shall be glorified in all

His saints; and until all His enemies, *i.e.* all spiritual, moral, and natural evil, sin, death, and hell, are put under His feet; that Jesus Christ is no less actually and far more effectually present in the world now by His spirit than formerly in His flesh; that Christianity is not the exercise of our faith upon past acts and operations of God, but a present acting and operation of God in and through our faith; that it is *primarily* from God to us, and only secondarily and responsively from us to God; that the Church and the sacraments represent, and to faith *are*, as in themselves they are, the objective and divine, as *faith* is the subjective and human, side of a very *real* transaction between God and us; that the sacraments therefore are real acts of God in Christ, and are to be received and interpreted as such, *i.e.* as *being* what they signify — all this I say, as it is the faith of the New Testament and the Church, so is it rational and comprehensible to all who hold an Incarnation at all, and who are able to take in what must be the scope of an Incarnation, if it exists. I would not concentrate all Christianity into the mystery of sacraments. Christianity is all religion or relation with God; all morality, virtue, and true manhood; all life and destiny; its end is *all* spiritual, moral, and natural ἐνέργεια, or activity and actuality. Nothing less than *all this* would I accept as that divine Salvation and regeneration of humanity which we call Christianity. But I believe that Salvation, regeneration, and Christianity are *from God to us*, and only reflexively from us to God. And I believe in a *present* God in Christ by the Holy Ghost saving, regenerating, and sanctifying

the world *through the Church*. I believe that all the weakness of the Church to regenerate, sanctify, and save is the inability of Christ through our want of faith. "He could not, because of their unbelief." "How would I . . . and ye would not." And I believe that what is wanted for the life of the Church, and of the world through it, is not faith in an absent, past, or future Christ, but simple and living recognition of a Christ present to our faith and present in our faith. What is the Church but this simple presence of Christ to and in Christians? Why should it be called His body if it is not the form and organ of His presence? What is Christianity but the living oneness of Christians with Christ and with one another in Christ, and how can it be so if He is not livingly present with and in them? And if He is, and the Church, through its proper functions as His body, is the organ of His acts, then what is baptism but the act by which Jesus Christ Himself takes us into Himself that He through our faith may become in us what He is in Himself; that being sanctified in Himself, He may be sanctified and glorified in us His saints?

We have now only to apply the same principles of interpretation to the other sacrament. As baptism is the sacrament of our uniting, so the Lord's Supper is that of our continuous and constantly renewed union and communion with God through Christ. They are both sacraments *of life*, *i.e.* of our union with the life who is Christ. They enable us to say that we are *in Christ*, and that *Christ is in us*. They thus supply a content to our faith which without them it would lack.

The innermost and most essential truth of the second sacrament, then, as also of the first, is κοινωνία, or fellowship of life. This we have seen to be the truth of the *peace offering*, — oneness with God, who is our life through faith. To which the *burnt offering* adds the additional and supplementary truth of self-devotion or service, — not only spiritual oneness with God's person and life, but moral fulfilment of God's will or law. These two are essential, — *holiness* and *righteousness*, — and they constitute the whole of religion on its positive side. Whatever additional elements attach themselves to the peace offering, — as confession or acknowledgment, praise, thanksgiving, etc., — they all centre in the one fact of life from God and in God and for God.

I have said before, that if our relation with God were an undisturbed and normal one; if our union and communion with Him were unbroken, and our service of Him unimpeded, the truth of the peace and the burnt offerings would be to us the whole of religion and of worship. In that case the Eucharist would embody no other elements than those of communion and devotion. Our life would still need to be that of God incarnating Himself in our faith and obedience. This life would still need to be imparted to us objectively, or *ab extra*, in order to be received by us subjectively. That is, there would still need to be a sacrament or divine act *to usward* from God, as the object to our faith and the *res*, or matter, for our acceptance; as the coming *to* us of the life to be received *in* us. All these elements, I repeat, would still exist in a Eucharist adapted to unfallen man.

But there are other elements inseparable from the religion and the worship of men who are fallen, and found, therefore, in the Christian Eucharist, which would not exist but for the fact of *sin*. They are represented by that third sacrificial act, most appropriately called, in the Old Testament, the περὶ ἁμαρτίας, or sin offering. The notion of our life in God as a salvation, a redemption, a resurrection, supposes a previous condition of sin, bondage, and death. In our worship, as in our lives, before union must come atonement; and before the service of a free obedience must come redemption. The sacrament, therefore, of our life in God is the sacrament, first, of our death in ourselves; the sacrament of our free service or obedience is, first, that of our emancipation from the bondage of our flesh or fallen nature. As in the Jewish system there was no peace or burnt offering, — no sacrifice of divine communion or self-devotion, — which was not *preceded* by the sin offering, so in the Christian system there is no sacrifice or sacrament of either communion with God or consecration of ourselves, which is not preceded by that of our death to, and our resurrection out of, the flesh of sin. The truth, *first* of the sin, and *then* of the peace and burnt offerings, — *first* of our at-one-ment and redemption, and *then* of our union and communion with, and our service of God, — is *all* contained in the great distinctive act of Christian worship. The Incarnated Life which is made our life, into which we were taken by baptism, in which we are nourished and sustained by the Holy Supper, around which as sacrifice and sacrament, in the supreme act

of our religion and worship, centre all our acknowledgments, praises, and thanksgivings towards God, and all our receptions from God, is a life which not only *is* in union with God, but *was brought into* union with God by the cross; which not only *is free* to live the life and work the works of God, but was *made free* by the crucifixion of the flesh of its bondage and the liberation of the spirit of a holy obedience.

Just as we are baptized into Christ only as we are baptized into the fellowship of His death and resurrection, so the Lamb whom we offer to God in the Eucharist and receive into ourselves as alone our life, our righteousness, ourselves received from and given to God, is "a Lamb as it had been slain." There is no Christ for us but Christ crucified and risen. The κοινωνία of His life is conditioned upon that of His death. We shall live with Him only as we have died with Him.

But the special point in which we are at present interested is the reality of the sacrament and of the language of the sacrament. If Jesus is in His Church as His living body, and its acts are His living acts, then they cannot but be *real*. The *real presence* in the sacrament is mere magic and superstition, apart from the more general real presence of Christ in His Church. Taken in connection with that, rationally understood and applied, the real presence is only a part of the general reality and actuality of Christ in Christianity; it is simply making the Church as His body the organ of His spiritual presence and activity in the world in the same real sense in which His natural body was the organ of His natural presence

and acts; it is a part of the general system of objective grace, without which there would be no subjective faith or life of Christ in the world. If there is nothing outward from God to be received, there can be no real inward reception on our part. If Jesus Christ does not Himself unite us with Himself in union, and Himself sustain that union in continuous communion, then no faith of ours makes us, or can make us, in any real and actual sense sons of God and partakers of the divine life. There is a use, and an important use, in the sacrament, simply as standing for and affirming the objective reality and real presence of *God's part* in our Salvation, the objective grace without which there would not be the subjective faith which is only responsive to and receptive of it. But the sacrament, according to any New Testament or Catholic conception, is a dead formality if it is only something put there to *represent* God's part and is not God Himself present to perform, and actually performing, His part in our Salvation. Why should it not be? Are we dealing with a dead or an absent Christ? If a grace *ab extra* is essential to the response of a faith of acceptance *ab intra*, why should the grace be dissociated from those acts in and through which God in Christ purports to impart it? Is it because of the liability of men to make *mere* forms of these acts, and then to attach to them as mere forms a magical power to effect something which is called, but which is no real, Salvation? I freely admit all that can possibly be said about this liability; but what is the proper remedy for it? Is it not, in the most rational, the

most spiritual, the most natural way possible, to endeavor to make them *not* mere forms, but living realities? Surely God is not a superstition! Nor Jesus Christ, when properly understood as God's self-incarnation to us and in us; nor the Holy Ghost, as the spirit or personal principle of the subjective presence and life of God and of Christ in men. And that God in Christ by the Holy Ghost should be *present to us* objectively in the Church and its functions and *present in us* subjectively in the Church through its functions, has nothing in it of magical or superstitious. Simply, then, to receive the gospel of our Salvation in the good faith in which it is offered; to take God at His word and accept His sacraments for what they mean, and through their grace and help to look for and expect the fulfilment of God in us and of ourselves in God, — this, it seems to me, is the natural and only way to remove all formality from the sacraments, and to make them God's realities to us and living realities in us.

Assuming the existence in the Eucharist of, first, a *sacrificium*, and secondly, a *sacramentum*, let us see what each of these must be. In the *sacrificium* there is the representation and presentation *to God* of the death and resurrection of Christ as, first, the one only perfect and complete act of human access to God, and secondly, as alone rendering possible and constituting *our* perfect and complete access to God. In that offering we discard all other pleas, or claims, or grounds, or means of access to God, save that only of Christ's death and resurrection. We come into

the Holy of Holies only with His shed blood and through the rent veil of His flesh. This is highly symbolical language; it is expressing the facts and truths of the absolute religion of the New Testament in the forms of Old Testament type and symbol. And such poetical forms appeal to the imagination and understanding and heart of men and make the truth living and real to them, if only the truth be not lost under the symbol. But lest this be the case with us, let us strip away the symbol and look at the truth itself in its simplicity. We have seen that the truth expressed by the sin offering is that death which every man must die in his flesh in order to any union with or service of God; that the truth of the peace offering is the union with God into which we are brought, and that of the burnt offering is the service of God which is rendered possible by the precedent fact of the sin offering. We have seen also that the distinctive difference between the offerings in the Old Testament and the one offering in the New Testament *for men*, and that which constituted the inefficacy of the former and the efficacy of the latter, was *this:* That whereas the former could only *represent* and be accepted *instead of* the acts of men, the latter could *be* and be accepted *as* the act of men. Dropping now the symbolic language and speaking literally, we say that Jesus Christ in His human life, death, and resurrection performed an act which was for humanity its death in the flesh, its at-one-ment or restored union and communion of life with God, and its redemption or restoration to the freedom of God's holy service and righteousness. By the sacrifice of

the altar what we acknowledge to God — along with our praises, homage, thanksgiving, etc. — is *this:* That Jesus Christ is *God our Salvation*, and our only Salvation; that He is our atonement, our redemption, our resurrection — our holiness, our righteousness, and our life; that He is our *way* into the favor, presence, and fellowship of God, *i.e.* that His death is, not only in Him but in us, the rending of the flesh of sin which was the veil of our separation from God, and His resurrection is our entrance into the oneness with God from which sin had separated us. The *sacrificium* is our acknowledgment to God, and the *sacramentum* is God's impartation to us, of the whole truth and reality of Christ's death and resurrection. By our feast upon the sacrifice the virtue of the sacrifice is made ours. In a true sacrament the grace and power and full reality of Christ's death to sin is so imparted to us as to be made and to become *our* death to sin; and equally is His spiritual and moral life to God so imparted to us as to be made verily and indeed *our* life to God. I have before said that the only difference between a divine *imputation* and a divine *impartation*, — the imputation, *e.g.* and the impartation of Christ's *death* to us, — is that the former makes *potentially* what the latter makes *actually* our own. In the divine grace and our answering faith that is made in a moment and in all its ideal completeness *ours*, which in fact can only perfectly become ours by a slow process of gradual appropriation and assimilation.

In speaking of what I have called the literal and real truth of the language of the sacrament, I have,

perhaps, failed to make a distinction which ought to be made between the terms *literal* and *real*. "This is my body" may express a very real without expressing a literal fact. The doctrine of transubstantiation seems to me to assume that the *real* truth of our Lord's words is inseparable from their *literal* truth. The doctrine of the real presence assumes a reality which is separable from mere literalness, and which is not less real and far higher for being so separated. Every *verbum Dei* must *be* what it *means*, but it must be so in the sphere, or order of being, in which it is meant or intended. We speak of *knowing* Christ, but St. Paul says that we do not any longer know Him κατὰ σάρκα, but only κατὰ πνεῦμα. Our Lord Himself spoke of our continuing to see Him, hear Him, etc.; and we do not doubt that we do so in a very real, although not in a literal, sense. We do not see or hear or know Him with natural or literal eyes or ears or understanding. Not only is the Christ Himself now ὁ πνευμάτικος, but His whole relation is to us only as *we* are πνευμάτικοι. That is, He is related to us and we to Him, we know Him, we receive Him, through the organs and functions of our spiritual, and not those of our natural lives. As we do not literally and yet do really see and hear Him, so we do not literally and yet do really eat and drink Him. We receive, assimilate, and convert Him into our very selves, none the less, but far the more because we do not do so through natural mouths and stomachs. We receive Him as really, as "verily and indeed," through the organs and functions of our spiritual lives as we receive natural food

through the organs of our natural life. And, moreover, we receive Him *in* the sacrament; in which the bread and wine *are* to us His flesh and blood. The very purpose and use of the sacrament is to represent and to *be* to us the objective element and part in our spiritual life, that which we *receive* as the condition of what, through it, we are to be and do. It is to save us from the heresy and the vanity of a merely subjective spiritual life, a life by our own act or state of mind; instead of which it makes our life an act of Christ entering into and incarnating Himself in our acts and states of mind. But *how* shall Christ thus objectively come to us *except* in some objective act? How can He speak to us without some language, and appear to us save in some symbol of His presence?

Sacraments are immediate acts of Christ to us, symbols of His real presence and actual operations to usward. In order that we shall receive them as such, it is necessary for us to receive them as *being* what they mean, as *effecting* what they signify or represent. But what they are and effect is all in the sphere of the spiritual, not of the natural. What we predicate of them κατὰ πνεῦμα we are not obliged to predicate κατὰ σάρκα. To the spiritual man the consecrated bread and wine *are* the body and blood of Christ, and the very food, or substance and matter, of his life. To the natural man, in the sphere of the senses and of natural science, they are *not* so, but still, in accidents and substance, only bread and wine. Here as elsewhere we know and have to do with Christ *not* κατὰ σάρκα, in no merely carnal or natural form of His, and through no merely carnal or natural senses

or functions of ours, but *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, only as He presents Himself to and can be received by our spiritual organs into our spiritual lives.

But still the question remains. What are "the body and blood of Christ," which are objectively or divinely given, and subjectively or humanly received, in the Lord's Supper? What is it which under the terms "body and blood of Christ," is verily and indeed given and received? The question, it will be observed, is not now, *how* it is given and received, but *what* is given and received?

If this question is to be answered in the light of the whole New Testament teaching, I think we must say, first, that what is given and received in the Lord's Supper is *Jesus Christ Himself*, as not only our new lives, but our new selves, as the ideal and spiritual self which in every man is to take the place of his actual and carnal self. As once for all, in baptism, we put off the old man and put on the new, put off ourselves and put on Christ, so, in every communion, we repeat that act. For while in the grace of God, and in our own answering faith, we are once for all passed out of ourselves into Christ, yet in fact we need constantly by the grace of God to be putting off ourselves and putting on Christ. Baptism may be said to correspond to what is now called our justification, and the Holy Communion to our sanctification. The one is the once-for-all identification of us with Christ, and the other is the gradual and progressive identification of us with Christ.

Secondly, what is given and received in the Holy

Communion is Jesus Christ *crucified and risen*, *i.e.* Christ in all the meaning and results of His life and work on earth. As in the *sacrificium* we represent and present and plead before God, Jesus Christ as not only our peace and burnt, but our sin offering, *i.e.* as not only our union with, and our service of, God, but (what is necessary, first, as the condition of these) our death to all separation from God, and our life in all union with and service of Him, so in the sacrificial feast or *sacramentum*, what we receive from God in Christ is first the spirit and power and reality, the fellowship, of His *death;* and *then* only the communication and communion of His life.

Where is the significance and propriety of expressing such a giving and receiving of Jesus Christ in His death and resurrection, to be *our* death and life, by the terms of His giving us and our receiving, and eating and drinking, *His flesh and blood?*

The Old Testament feast upon the sacrifice meant the subjective appropriation by the offerer — or, rather, the impartation to the offerer, through his subjective faith and personal appropriation — of the objective truth and meaning and benefits of the sacrifice. What was true *to* him in the sacrifice became, or was made, true *in him* in the sacrament. The latter is the application to him of the *grace*, of the spirit and power and reality, of the former. *Flesh and blood* means, first, *humanity*. As Jesus Christ took *our* flesh and blood, *i.e.* our humanity, to sanctify, redeem, and raise it, so He gives us *His* flesh and blood, or His humanity, sanctified, redeemed, and

risen. He imparts to us the powers of the *new humanity* which He has instituted, by becoming in us the holiness, the righteousness, and the life of God. Secondly, the *flesh and blood* given us in the Holy Communion are flesh broken and blood shed; it is not only humanity, but humanity in sacrifice, brought into covenant with God by sacrifice. A humanity, that is, which has become *new* through the death in it of that which was *old*, through its own crucifixion in itself, as well as God's crucifixion in it, of the flesh of sin.

Is not this a sufficient explanation and justification of the "This is my body and my blood"? And if we take our Lord at His word, just as baptism is to us God's justification, so will the Holy Communion be to us God's sanctification. It will be Christ imparted to us in the spirit, power, and life in us of that one only full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice and oblation which God accepts as the satisfaction for our sin, because it is able to be, and *is* to all who believe, the death of our sin, and our resurrection from sin.

MANAGEMENT
YMAMU
NOW

Just Published. 12mo. $1.75.

Rev. Professor H. E. Ryle.

The Canon of the Old Testament. An Essay on the Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture. By H. E. Ryle, M.A., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. 12mo. $1.75.

"This volume is remarkable in two ways. It is written by one of the new men at Cambridge (England), one of the divines who have been trained under Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort, and who is full of the reverent spirit with which the Bible is now critically studied by leading English scholars.

"The other point of note is, that conclusions of critical scholarship are here accepted, and freely applied to the explanation of the Scriptures and the determination of the way in which these writings were gradually put together and made to form the Hebrew Canon of Scripture. . . .

"We cannot too highly praise Professor Ryle's courage in writing this book or his serious and candid and honest purpose in keeping, as far as possible, out of the range of speculations and dealing with plain matters of scholarship and of fact.

"He has not published a mass of undigested materials, but has brought them together and digested them so thoroughly that any candid mind can use his work and follow him in his efforts to trace the gradual growth and the formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture.

"It is an immense gain to have this work done in a popular form, not by a radical scholar, whose aim is mainly critical and destructive, but by a man who is thoroughly reverent in his spirit and candid and honest in his scholarship.

"This is the first popular and satisfactory book on the Old Testament which can be put into the hands of an intelligent layman, with the satisfaction that it will lead him, not to set aside the Bible as a book that has no message for him, but to deeper and more profound respect for its contents, and to a desire to go far more thoroughly into such knowledge of the truth as these sacred writings show the Hebrew people to have possessed.

"It is a notable day when English biblical scholarship produces a book of this kind.

"It is right to add that, while it is within the reach of the ordinary man, it is equipped with scholarly apparatus which will satisfy the demands of our ablest scholars." — *Sunday Herald, Boston.*

MACMILLAN & CO.,

112 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

ALEXANDER. — The Leading Ideas of the Gospels. By the Right Rev. WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. New Edition, revised and enlarged. pp. xxxii, 332. Crown 8vo. $1.75.

THE Bishop of Derry explains in the Preface to this new edition that "this volume, in its present shape, is rather a new book than a new edition. . . . In addition to revision of the original matter, several important additions have been made: (1) The conception of Leading Ideas in the Gospels has been carefully guarded, and discriminated from the extravagant application of it which might make the evangelists appear to be romantic idealogists; (2) the study of St. Luke's Gospel has been specially enlarged, and a principle of division adopted (from the circumstances of his life; from his special training; from his natural endowments) which seems adapted to dealing with his Leading Ideas. The subject of St. Luke's alleged Ebionitism has also been carefully examined; the most sacred portion of a narrative where all is sacred — the record of the Passion — has been elucidated by the Leading Ideas of the evangelist. A synopsis has been prefixed, and an index appended."

"The work in this issue has been so altered in revisal and so greatly enlarged as to be a new book, in which the doctrine formerly set forth in a series of sermons has been developed into a well-reasoned theological treatise." — *Scotsman.*

MILLIGAN. — The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. 12mo. $2.25.

MILLIGAN. — Lectures on the Apocalypse. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. 12mo. $1.50.

The Religious Systems of the World. A Contribution to the Study of Comparative Religion. 8vo. Cloth. $4.50.

Among the fifty-four contributors are Canon RAWLINSON, Sir ALFRED LYALL, Prof. T. W. RHYS-DAVIDS, Rev. Sir S. W. COX, Bart., M.A., C. F. KEARY, G. W. LEITNER, LL.D., OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., Canon SHUTTLEWORTH, J. ALLANSON PICTON, M.A., M.P., Rev. DAVID FOTHERINGHAM, Sir FRED. POLLOCK, FREDERIC HARRISON, etc.

"It is an interesting and valuable volume both for the theologian and the general reader. It is almost an encyclopædia of the religions of the world." — *Christian Union.*

MACMILLAN & CO.,

112 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

DATE DUE

JAN 4 78

RESERVE

NOV 28 [illegible]

JUN 17 1993

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

95863

234P
D853
c.2

AUTHOR
Soteriology of the NT

TITLE
Du Bose

95863

234P
D853
c.2

00005799